

THE
ANDOVER REVIEW

VOLUME XVII.—PUBLISHED MONTHLY.—NUMBER XCIX.

MARCH, 1892

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. THE CHRIST AND THE CREATION. <i>Rev. John Coleman Adams</i>	225
2. THE DUDLEIAN LECTURE FOR THE YEAR 1891. <i>Professor Emerton</i>	238
3. VIEWS OF DR. A. BAER ON DRUNKENNESS. <i>Dr. Arthur MacDonald</i>	259
4. REFLECTIONS OF A PRISONER	265
5. PESSIMISM'S PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS TO THE MINISTRY. <i>Mr. Gerald H. Beard</i>	272
6. MISSIONS WITHIN AND WITHOUT CHRISTENDOM. <i>Rev. Charles C. Starbuck</i>	277
7. EUDÆMONISTIC ETHICS.—A REPLY. <i>Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster</i>	293
8. EDITORIAL.	
RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY	298
LEWIS FRENCH STEARNS	307
THE CHRISTIAN ACADEMY	308
HOW MUCH DID THE AMERICAN BOARD MEAN IN GRANTING TO THE PRUDENTIAL COMMITTEE LIBERTY TO ASK "SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS"?	312
9. NOTES FROM ENGLAND. <i>Mr. Joseph King, M.A.</i>	318
10. BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.	
Knox's A Winter in India and Malaysia among the Methodist Missions, 321. — La-visse's General View of the Political History of Europe, 321. — Caldecott's English Colonization and Empire, 324. — Pierson's The Divine Enterprise of Missions, 326.	
11. BOOKS RECEIVED	327



D25 Public Library 92*

BOSTON
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY
NEW YORK: 11 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET
The Riverside Press, Cambridge
LONDON: WARD, LOCK, BOWDEN & CO., WARWICK HOUSE, SALISBURY SQUARE

Entered at the Post Office at Boston as second-class matter

TERMS—SINGLE NUMBERS, 35 CENTS

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$4.00

Uncle Tom's Cabin, Universal Edition, for 25 Cents!



First Issue of this Universal Edition,
160,000 Copies.

In a striking paper cover, 25 cents; in cloth, 50 cents.
As a regular number of the Riverside Paper Series, large type, at 50 cents.

* * * For sale by all Booksellers. Sent by mail, postpaid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

Houghton, Mifflin & Company,
4 Park Street, Boston; 11 East 17th Street, New York.





THE
ANDOVER REVIEW:
A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. XVII.—MARCH, 1892.—No. XCIX.

THE CHRIST AND THE CREATION.

ONE of the favorite feats of modern Biblical criticism is the attempt to show that since the New Testament writers vary greatly in the conceptions they present of Jesus Christ, they therefore have in mind very different personalities, or at best but the uncertain sense of the same person; and so we are made to feel, as Dr. Martineau tells us in his latest and most disappointing book, that the image of the real Jesus "becomes confused, and its living expression almost fades from view," in the accounts of evangelist and apostle. But the practical reason of mankind robs this attempt of all its destructive force. A difference in the point of view introduces an almost absolutely new terminology. The chemist describing the sun to his class, the astronomer outlining its functions as a centre of worlds, would both use a vocabulary which is of no use to the invalid who wants to set forth the reviving effects its rays have had on his enfeebled body. It is one of the necessities of the existence of such a being, as Christendom assumes Jesus to have been, that He should present a new aspect to every new age and to every new school of thought. Just in proportion, too, as He is a real and definite phenomenon in the world's history, and not a shifting wraith of the imagination, will it become necessary to translate the statement of his relations to mankind into the language of each new generation. Yet all variations of phrase describe the same personality, and only serve to unfold his enlarging relations as they develop with the process of moral evolution. Jesus Christ is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." But to bring his personality and his work home to the reason and conscience of man requires a different statement

in the nineteenth century from one that suited the mood of the first.

Thus, to be specific, it was inevitable that Jesus himself should address his efforts to the men and women nearest to Him. His mind grasped the functions which in God's providence his own nation was called to fill in the evolution of a new and spiritual economy. He saw how that conception, distorted and narrowed as it had become, filled the minds of his countrymen. He therefore strove to make them realize how He came in fulfillment of that providence, and for the further unfolding of the divine plan. He put himself before that Jewish age as the fulfillment of the law and the prophets, the Messiah who was to come, the Christ, the Son of the living God. This, to his own people and generation, was the fittest interpretation of his work which could be given. For, since his immediate audience was filled with the sense of God's purpose in committing to Israel a certain leadership of mankind, what was more natural, necessary, inevitable, than that He who saw with a clear prevision in what a broad and universal sense "salvation is of the Jews," should make his first appeal as the Messiah, the Anointed One, the long-expected Son of David?

But the mind of Christ was broader than Judaism. It was He who interpreted to his people their own true relations to the human race. He presented himself even to his own countrymen, not alone as their Messiah, but as the Saviour of the world. He lifted his cross before them, not as the rallying point of disheartened Israel, but as the standard of the world's salvation. He stood forth, indeed, as the fulfillment of the desire of Israel, the Messiah of this nation of the indomitable hope, the Son of David and of Abraham; and all Scripture uttering the longing and the hope of his patient people was to Him vocal with portents of his advent. But, to his mind, his own work had larger proportions. It was the founding of a universal kingdom. It was the imparting of a new life to human nature. It was the spiritual renewal of the world. In the very words, therefore, in which He spoke to his own age, He gave a sign to those who would present his name to the uttermost ages. He rose above race lines to the proclamation of universal relations. He speaks to the nineteenth century as well as to the first. He declares himself the fulfillment of the world's hope. He is "*the desire of all nations.*" He is the Son of Man, carrying on in direct line of ascent the inheritance of life which has been the accumulating possession of

our race. Indeed, He is all this *because* He is the Messiah of the Jews and the Prince of the House of David. Because He is the Anointed One of Israel, He is the fulfillment of all human life.

For the time has surely come when we may safely discard that view of the place and work of revelation which would make it a thing irregular, anomalous, thrown into creation from without, and having no relations nor affinities with God's other processes or works. It is time to put a new interpretation upon what used to be called in sadly mechanical phrase "the plan of salvation." That method of God is not an irregularity in the divine plan. It is its crown and culmination, had in mind from the beginning, the goal "toward which the whole creation moves." Miracles, and the so-called supernatural in life, are neither violations of nature nor extra-natural. If we are able to comprehend the connection of God's providence in Israel with his providence among all people, if we realize that salvation is the final step in all the upward march of man, if we feel how impossible it is that God should do anything "unnatural" or "non-natural" in a creation all of whose activities proceed from Him, then we shall have no difficulty in considering the advent of Jesus the Christ as a natural event in the course of the world's history, related to all that has preceded and to all that comes after. It is a part of the great system of nature, using that word to denote all the manifestations of divine activity in and through created things. It is the fulfillment of all history. It is the coming to pass of all prophecy. It is the completion of the great process of evolution, by the introduction of the highest race of human beings, whose type and progenitor is "the new Adam," Jesus Christ.

It is a singular mistake which sets up this view of the person and work of Jesus Christ as a strange or heretical doctrine. It was the teaching of the church from a very early date. It was a doctrine which as early a Christian as Paul the apostle put into a form which even to-day it is somewhat difficult to better. For Paul, with a comprehensiveness far beyond his contemporaries, apprehending the mind of Jesus, makes Him the world's Messiah. Without ignoring his relation to the stock from which, after the flesh, the Christ came forth, he nevertheless perceives the place He takes as the fulfillment of elder prophecy, and the yearning of many hearts in that chosen race. He saw in Jesus the Christ "the seed of Abraham," and he insisted that "to Abraham and his seed were the promises made." But he also saw in his own

nation, and the long discipline it had received, only a course of education, leading up to the manifestations of the Christ. "The law was our tutor to bring us unto Christ." And in this Christ he saw revealed "the desire of many nations." In Him there was to be no more Jew or Gentile, but the manifestation of a life and a spirit and a type belonging to all humanity, a universal force and a universal light. In this Paul was a truer Jew than they who still awaited the Messiah as a messenger to their own little race, a deliverer of their own nation, the avenger of old wrongs or the founder of a new society, with Israel as its cornerstone. He saw the wider purpose of God, and the true intent for which Israel had been raised up. He therefore proclaims Christ the Son of David, in relations wide as the world, — wide, indeed, as the creation. He names Him "the second Adam;" "the first-born of every creature;" "the head," and the "first fruits" of the new creation. He declares that in Jesus the Christ (or with reference to Him) "were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him and unto him." No lucid construction can be put upon these words which does not interpret them as in some sense conveying the apostle's conception of the relation of Jesus to the whole creation, past, present, and to come, as the goal toward which all lower life has been advancing, the transition from a lower manhood to a glorified humanity, true Son of Man, yet true Son of God as well. According to his thought the whole creation is a prophecy of this Messiah. Every atom in the deep courses of the rocks and in the enfolding airs which girdle the earth, every pennyweight of matter and every wave of force, laws of the revolving worlds and affinities of the fluent particles, the controlling tendencies of society and the movements of the human mind and spirit, all things in the unfolding life of the world, point forward to this new-comer, in whom man himself, the climax of all lower life, crosses the borders of a new order, and begins to live no longer for time, but for eternity; no longer for the flesh, but after the spirit.

Of course, all that we are saying depends for its truthfulness upon a full acceptance of the doctrine which dominates all clear Christian thinking to-day, of the "Indwelling God," the immanence of God in the creation. That great truth is necessary to a right understanding of what we mean when we say that the Christ is a "natural product" of humanity, a part of nature, and one of

the links in the chain of evolution. That could only be an erroneous and sadly misleading statement, unless we understood that nature was God manifesting himself, and evolution his method of gradual self-manifestation, and humanity the germ of a life and type that shall partake fully of the divine. And so when we take this stand with reference to the relation of the Christ to nature, we do so in the belief that "nature" is a term which ought to cover all God's processes, and not merely those that come before and under man. We do so, moreover, in the full belief that whatever there is in nature God himself put there, a part of his own life and power and thought. There is not an atom, nor a force, nor a law in creation which is not the outcome of the same Being that breathes by the Holy Spirit upon the heart of man. The unfolding, enlarging, ascending life of creation is fed all the time out of the life of God. As the earthly forces push upward, God stoops to meet them. Or, better still, it is He who supplies the impulse by which they work out their tendencies, so that when they culminate in the soul of man it is simply God meeting himself, and receiving out of creation what He has put into it.

It is inevitable that this thought should lead us to the conclusion that this infinite energy which is forever pouring itself into the creation should intend some higher manifestation of itself than is reached in the natural man. The human race is a mighty achievement of the creative power. But it is an imperfect one. It looks to the future for its own fulfillment and rounded life. Its very greatness and capacity are the guarantee of something higher to come out of it. For the greatest homage we pay human nature lies in the direction of what it may do, rather than in the direction of what it has done,— its future, and not its past. Therefore we look to see humanity's life uplifted and glorified by some process yet to be revealed, some phase of creation yet held in reserve. But clearly such a step forward and upward can only mean one thing. It can only come through the same process and from the same force we call upon to account for whatever has gone before. It will simply mean more of God given forth into the creation. It will be a larger bestowing of the divine life imparted to the world. It will be the uplifting of the human soul into a closer share in the life of God, the outpouring of God's life so as to expand and perfect a human nature. It will be the fuller manifestation of the indwelling God. This is the only consistent ground that theism can take. And it does not appear that there is anything in it to which a scientific mind can take exception. If

there is to be a new type of life added to the long series which still seems to lack completion, and if that new type is to be "not a new physical form, but an elevation into a new spiritual world," and if it is to come in the old method and order of evolution, through a selected individual, then we shall look for it in the direction of a divine man. We shall expect to see this divine energy, which is back of all life, and which has worked up and through all types and forms, display itself in larger measure in some human nature. There shall be a new man, and the new man shall be the old man, made after a diviner manner, filled with a larger measure of the life of the indwelling God. So that he shall be a divine man, God insperring himself in human nature, a God-man, the incarnation of God.

It does not appear that in this statement we in any wise strain any of the propositions which we have gathered one by one from the consenting thought of our age. It does not seem as if we overdrove upon the beliefs of theism, nor the admissions of the scientific philosophy. We have simply followed the pointing of these converging beliefs, and passed on to the point where they all meet and coincide. And where does that bring us? Are we not back at the old and familiar standpoint of Christianity, the centre from which the gospel starts, the very seed-thought of every creed in Christendom? What these strengthening faiths of men justify us in believing might occur, the New Testament asserts has occurred. It is the essential doctrine of Christianity that the indwelling God has crowned the work of the ages by bestowing upon a human nature the fullness of his own. He who has given himself in a measure to man now pours the fullness of his spirit and power into a human soul, so as to fill it in all its parts,—affections, volitions, and consciousness. This is that great fact declared in John's gospel: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." That it is which Paul announces, saying: "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the godhead bodily," and declaring that "God was manifest in the flesh." The God who is "above all and through all and in (us) all," after the successive revelations of himself to which the unfolding creation bears witness, at length in the fullness of the ages, throws all the abundance of his love and wisdom into the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and in Him creates at once the second Adam, or the Son of Man, and the first-born of every creature, or the Son of God.

Now it ought to seem neither startling nor strained in a world whose government is a single head, and whose laws and forces all lock and interlock and stand together, that the very earliest processes in the progressive development of that world should forecast the latest; for in the well-planned building the foundations imply the superstructure, the corner-stone predicts the capstone. At every stage in the process of construction the observer ought to be able to see how every other stage was a preparation for the last. So in this process of creation-building, this evolution of a spiritual humanity, there should be, as indeed there does appear, a clear and indisputable connection between the earlier and the later manifestations of the divine energy. The very nebula, glowing in its fiery heats, and whirling off great rings of vapor to be condensed into worlds, sheds its shining light down the shadowy deeps of time, and shows the white figure of the coming man, the sinless soul, waiting the lapse of the long cycles of preparation for the fullness of time, and in which He shall be revealed.

As we stand at this late point in the creation, and the long procession of life winds before our eyes, we are conscious of a high and mysterious power, in whose presence we must stand with hearts abashed and awe-struck, moulding the successive forms of life into higher and nobler types, in whose unbroken continuity we can discern the way gradually opening for the advent of humanity. Nor is it too much to say, when the first human being steps upon the stage of life, that all the lines of this great drama were written with Him in view, that all its scenery was arranged to culminate in him. For the nebula foretells the glowing sphere of the earth, and the hot globe foretells the hardening rocks, and the rocks as they shrivel into hollows and ridges foretell the waters which are to flow in these river courses and ocean beds, the silt of their torrents and chafing tides hardening into other rocks or ploughed up into soil. The soil, in time, foretells the plant which is to grow up in it, the plant foretells the living creatures which will build in its branches or browse on its leaves, and every form of animal life, fish, flesh, or fowl, has in view the erect figure, the straightforward eye, the dextrous hand, and intelligent lips of man, the crown of the physical creation. The universe is a unit. It has unfolded according to one steadfast law. The beginning had the end in view, and the end has its root in the beginning. All the early creation which has not yet even found a voice to utter itself, nor a consciousness to perceive itself,

is filled with prophetic signs of the coming Messiah, with reference to whom every rock fell into its place, and every bone was set in the skeleton of the beast.

Does it seem to overweight the doctrine of the unity of the race to say all this? It were impossible to say anything without saying so much. Go the mile with the evolutionist when he insists on the "continuity of life," the interdependence of present and past, and you must go another mile with the Christian theist, when he affirms that the whole lower order of creation points to the coming of the spiritual man. For in the plan and purpose of the world it is indisputable that the whole life of the past is summed up in man, and it is the contention of every theist that the only real significance in man's life is his devotion to the highest moral ends. But if the moral aim is the goal of man's life, it must be of all life, and of all the rest of the series up to his own soul. "If mechanism reigns in nature," says Paul Jenet, "it reigns everywhere, and in ethics as well as in physics." And contrariwise must we not say that, if the moral aim dominates the human race, we must trace it back through every step and stage of the long way from chaos to the Christ, and assume that this goal has been in view from the first; and so the very law of gravitation, and the chemical affinities of matter, prove to have been tributary to the Ten Commandments and the law of love. As everything in the creation tends upward to man, so man tends constantly to a state of spirituality. Under the leadings of God his senses lose their way, his lower affections weaken, his reason, his conscience, his manifest sentiments acquire larger control of him. The process of creation does not end with the physical man, nor in his intellectual or moral life, when that is inharmonious and deranged by a sinful will. There is a higher mark still which lies along the line of man's spiritual nature. There is a higher man possible than these poor warring creatures who shed one another's blood on fields of carnage; a better man than he who debauches body and soul with poison drink and licentious passions; a better than he who accumulates goods for himself and leaves his brother to rags and hunger. The carnal man is the forerunner of the spiritual man. The trend of life is toward obedience and spirituality and love. Creation looks forward in expectancy, not only of man's soul, but also of man's soul become disciplined and reconciled to right and to God. And just as the creation was looking and waiting for the appearance upon earth of one who should carry up the organism of the animal into some

finer form, the body of the first Adam, so when the soul of man was called forth, creation waited again to see that soul regulated, harmonized with divine law, subject to God's perfect will. There was a prophecy in all the organs of the lower creatures of that splendid organism which is in the service of humanity. The eye of the fish was the forerunner of the wonderful lens that turns with equal power on the stars and on the dust-mote. The paw of the tiger was prophetic of the flexible and versatile hand, finest of all machines which nature makes. In like manner all the lower forms of life bear in them a prediction of the noblest of physical forms, the body of man. So man's narrow, weak, and warring passions, by their very imperfections, look forward to a completeness in some riper age. Jesus the Christ is the sign of this life for all mankind. In Him we see a new influx of divine creative power, or, if you please, a new type in the creative process, as real and as marked as when the first man was called into being. He comes to humanity, the first-born of its new, its spiritual men. With Him begins a new epoch in the evolution of life.

It does not seem in any wise foreign to this argument to note how mankind has ever been reaching out and desiring just such a type and realization of its own ultimate and highest life. The craving is universal among enlightened beings for some soul to show the way unmistakably to the highest, the divinest life. All men make unto themselves some Christ. The whole world has felt this need of a Messiah, some Anointed One, bearing on his spirit the grace of the higher life, and the shining of the divine nature. The human fondness for heroes is not a weakness, but an ineradicable instinct of the soul. Carlyle truly says: "Faith is loyalty to some inspired teacher, some spiritual hero." An earlier philosopher, no less a mind than Seneca himself, acknowledges man's need of a moral ideal, a pattern by which conduct may be shaped. It has been well said that every night since man left the Garden of Eden he has been looking into the throbbing heavens for the Star of the East. Go to farthest Cathay and you find that one of the most authentic sayings of Confucius discloses a longing and an expectation that a higher and a better soul would come to our race: "Out of the West," were his words, "shall come the true saint." The Hindu waits the tenth and last incarnation of Vishnu. The Parsee expects the advent of the divine man. All through the past men have seized with eager joy upon any nature a little larger in its proportions, a little

grander and more dignified than the common type, and have called him a hero, demi-God, son of God. "The birth of a God-man," says some one, "has been the expectation of all history." Even where this craving of mankind has been attenuated into a vague and shadowy ideal of "a coming man," and a "perfected humanity," there is the same earnest expectation, the survival in the midst of much shipwreck of faith and religious feeling, of an imperishable, constitutional want of human nature, the need of a diviner form than we have in ourselves, or common lives about us, to realize for us the type and spirit of that which we are to become.

Thus it is that we have a right to say to him who cites this common instinct of human souls as an evidence that Christianity is only one more of man's schemes for supplying himself with an ideal, "Not so, Rather do these universal cravings of the awakened spirit create a presumption in favor of the special claims of the Christ of Christianity." All through creation we find it true that a constitutional want in any being is always met by something in its surroundings which satisfies that want. Why should it not be true, then, of man's highest developed want? The wing of the bird implies an atmosphere for it to beat. The foot of the mammal corresponds to a solid earth on which it may stand. The voice of a man tells of an ear into which it may utter itself. Why should not this great unquenchable need of human nature imply a satisfaction somewhere and somehow in God's economy? Thomas Carlyle said: "No nobler feeling than that of admiration for one higher than himself dwells in the breast of man. . . . Religion I find to stand upon it, not paganism only, but far higher religion, all religion hitherto known. Hero-worship, — heartfelt, prostrate admiration, burning, submissive, boundless, for a noblest, Godlike form of man, is not that the germ of Christianity itself?" Even so. "The desire of all nations" is an earnest of the Messiah who shall fulfill it. There is a prophecy of the Christ, not only in the word of Hebrew seers, strong and unmistakable though that is, but just as truly in the inextinguishable longing of mankind for one who shall satisfy their aspirations with a new and eternal impulse of life. Not the eastern magi alone, but a long procession of seeking souls have traversed earth's deserts and sought in her cities watching strange stars, and careful of signs and portents, searching for the Christ the Anointed One. Is it strange if God should satisfy this craving of the soul of man, and at last raise up the

new man, a human spirit "filled with all the fullness of the God-head bodily"?

All that is thus said of the fulfillment of a universal spirit of prophecy in no wise weakens the force or the significance of Jewish prophecy. As it is said of Darwinism that it creates more arguments for teleology than it destroys, so it may be said of this interpretation of the Christ and his relations to the creation; it creates a broader faith in the prophets of Israel than it destroys. The belief in the prophetic insight of Israel's seers does not rest on the narrower and literal theories of Messianic prophecy. It is not shaken by the proof that any given passage commonly applied to Jesus really means somebody or something contemporary with the prophet who uttered it. You may prove that he who wrote the words which Matthew applies to Him whom all men have since called Immanuel had not the remotest reference to Jesus. You may show that the words of Jeremiah, which Matthew quoted in connection with the slaughter of the innocents, were but a lamentation of the sad prophet over the sorrows of his people. You may even insist that the graphic words of the unknown prophet (attributed to Isaiah) describe not the man Jesus, but only an ideal, the coming man of Israel. Still you have not touched the great and vital truth that there was a spirit of prophecy in Israel, a looking forward to the future with a conviction that the golden age was yet to come, the world's evil lived down, and its conquest wrought through one whom this despised nation should give to the human race. This is the spirit of Old Testament prophecy. Israel's great minds saw clearly, her lesser minds with dimmer vision, what mankind still lacked to complete his spiritual history. They believed in the intent of God to provide for this need out of their own national stock. They felt the need of a higher ethics, a larger knowledge of God, a closer walk with Him.

Most of all, they felt, too, the need of some human life which should portray to men the divine spirit in human life. And this need and imperfection of man they proclaimed should be met and fulfilled in one who should be of their own people, a Jew of the Jews, a son of Abraham, fulfilling all the traditions of their nation. He who was born at Bethlehem was the fulfillment, in an unexpected sense, but still in the greatest truthfulness of the yearnings of the Jewish heart and of all its bold faith since Abraham received the promise. His advent does not destroy these early prophets, nor discredit their insight, nor belie their

thought. As the fruit fulfills the prophecy of the seed and rootlet and leaf and branch, so does Jesus of Nazareth fulfill the prophecy of Israel, and justify the words of the angel in the Apocalypse: "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."

Two thoughts seem to suggest themselves as fitting in this connection. One is that no other position of the view and work of Jesus Christ so well interprets and gives value to all the goodness and the holy life which was in the world before He came. When we unfold this revelation of fulfillment which Jesus sustains to man, there are always some to exclaim: "What, was there no goodness in human nature until his advent? Were there no good men, was there not spiritual life in noble hearts, before Christ lived and wrought?"

It ought not to be necessary to say that our whole argument rests upon the assumption that there was. The world was full of climbing, struggling, praying, self-denying goodness, and had been ever since God set the first soul on the way toward the kingdom. The great names which rise like the lonely peaks of earth's mountain ranges, solitary in their moral eminence, are glowing witnesses of the height to which humanity has risen. The countless saintly souls whose obscurity veils lives no less godly confirm the record. Yet one fact stands forever clear, and no amount of reverence for the splendid moral past of humanity can weaken it. The one conspicuous lack of the creation has been a type of what man is spiritually in God's thought, living forth that ideal in the flesh. There was an almost universal meaning in that saying of the apostle to Jesus: "Lo, all men are seeking for thee." All the spiritual attainment of mankind, and all moral character, were prophecies which He came to fulfill, who gathers in his own heart the aspirations and the strivings of our race. There was sight in the creation before the eye of man was formed. There was skill in touch before the hand was shaped. There are gleams of intelligence and reason, of memory and of foresight, of will, affection, thought, in the lower ranges of animal life. So there is virtue, love, righteousness, in all the world of human life and experience. Still, as we scan the elder world, we find no sign of any soul who might fairly be called *the type* of the new and spiritual life. Nowhere is there a spiritual ancestor, from whom all the sons of man inherit the diviner life in God. Our race lacked its spiritual Adam. It found him in the person of Jesus the Christ.

Mark, moreover, how truly his coming fulfills and carries on

the habitual course of the creation, which is to call forth the higher type, and begin the new variation of life, through some favored individual of the old. The line of progress in all the lower orders lies through chosen individuals. The common law of development has been to raise up and perfect an individual by means of a species, and then from that individual to start a new species of the higher grade. The gardener watches his beds, and selects the most promising and thrifty individual plants from which to propagate his new roses or chrysanthemums. The human race is engendered of some specially apt and susceptible stock, whose qualities fitted it to receive those crowning endowments which constitute the peculiar gifts of man. So, too, with this new life of the spirit, this age of holiness for which God was preparing this creation. That must follow this law of development. "It must have its beginning," says Matheson, "not in a general diffusion over the masses, but in the life of a solitary and single individual, who at first constitutes its only representative." And so we trace the beginning of the kingdom of God on earth back to one individual, to the advent of the divine life in a single human soul. There is a historic Christ. There is one person, who bears the divine image in unmarred beauty, in whose heart is the spirit which is to generate the new man in the human soul. He is Jesus of Nazareth, the carpenter's son, created to be "the first-born among many brethren," "the chief among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely." He who for nineteen centuries has filled the eyes of the advancing world, who has challenged all the criticism and braved all the doubt and unbelief of the world, rising all the while to higher glories and more worthy praise,—He it is who is "the first-born of every creature." His soul is the chosen channel for the new influx of heaven's sweetest and finest life. He is the fulfillment, not alone of Israel's life, but of all the slowly forming ages which belong to mankind, and even antedate the human race. The world's Messiah has appeared. The morning twilight of man's life on earth brightens to a shining dawn, as Jesus the Christ comes forth from the manger at Bethlehem to take his place at the head of the human race, as it moves over into the confines of the kingdom of heaven.

John Coleman Adams.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THE DUDLEIAN LECTURE FOR THE YEAR 1891.

SUBJECT : — “ For the detecting, and convicting and exposing the Idolatry of the Romish Church, their tyranny, usurpations, damnable heresies, fatal errors, abominable superstitions, and other crying wickedness in their high places, and finally, that the Church of Rome is that mystical Babylon, that man of sin, that apostate church, spoken of in the New Testament.”

I HAVE in my possession a programme of the dissertations presented for the Master’s degree at Harvard College in the year 1758. Of the twenty-one subjects, fourteen are clearly theological ; the rest are mainly of a philosophical or speculative character, suggesting the close possibility of a theological treatment. President John Adams, a political philosopher of twenty-three, replied affirmatively to the inquiry whether civil government be absolutely necessary to men. Samuel Locke denied the proposition that the human reason is sufficient unto salvation. Moses Hemenway, who was, perhaps, a radical in his day, denied that miracles, of themselves, prove a revelation.

These three subjects, printed in bold type upon the programme, were, I suppose, those parts which were actually delivered. Other topics were : Whether the star which appeared at the birth of Christ was a comet ? denied by David Sewall ; Whether the phenomenon of rain proves a Providence ? affirmatively maintained by Joseph Stockbridge ; Whether it is consistent with the divine justice that the whole race of man is subject to death for the sin of one ? Samuel Dana in the affirmative. The only topic which could not by some twist be given a theological turn is : Whether commerce be as much injured by excessive duties as by a predatory war ? Henry Appleton thought it was.

I find this programme very instructive as to the point of view of the community, which, from that day to this, has found in Harvard College the expression of its best thought. Theological speculation of the most eager and the most abstruse kind was the chief occupation of the best trained minds in New England, and the drift of this speculation was overwhelmingly towards the support of the faith of the Fathers. There was but one youth among the Masters of Arts of Harvard College of that year who — so far as our programme indicates — ventured upon the defense of a plainly unorthodox opinion : Jacob Eliot denied the proposition that we are bound to believe as the Church believes.

We must not suppose, however, that unorthodox ideas were un-

known to the men of New England in that day. One can easily detect in the topics chosen by these young warriors for attack or defense the reaction of movements of thought in the greater world, which were imperiling some of the dearest inheritances of New England Calvinism. In that year, 1758, Voltaire, at the height of his incredible productiveness, with twenty years of work before him, was the most admired, the most feared, and the most hated man in Europe. David Hume, a man of forty-seven, was just winning recognition as the foremost champion of a system of thought which, if carried out as it was sure to be, must change the whole method of approach to the profoundest problems of philosophy and religion. Rousseau was captivating the world with revolutionary theories of education. Adam Smith was soon to put forth that wonderful summary of the principles of national house-keeping, which was to create a new school of thought in the world of material production and exchange; and Edward Gibbon, a youth of twenty-one, just returned from a residence on the continent, was beginning those studies which, by the method of calm, historical analysis, were to subject the institutions of the Christian organization to the same frank inquiry as would be demanded for those of any other human organization.

The air of Europe, and of America as well, was alive with revolution; a generation more, and it was to burst forth with uncontrollable energy in every field of human activity. The stage of that Harvard Commencement, then as now the mimic reflex of the life in its own community, shows the answer of a keen and acute generation to the stormy challenge from without. These men were not all blind conservatives,—their record in the coming struggle proves it,—but they were men who expected to found all the activity of their lives, revolutionary as much of it might be, upon the solid traditions of religious faith in which they had been reared. Even John Adams, sturdy fighter in the cause of political innovation, and opposed to the extreme Calvinism about him, suffered the assaults of infidelity, with which he took every pains to make himself familiar, to pass harmlessly by him.

It was in this community, six years before, that Paul Dudley, chief justice of Massachusetts, had closed his long and active life. Himself a layman, an eager student of natural science, Fellow of the Royal Society, and author of numerous treatises in the transactions of that learned body, he, too, like the rest of his contemporaries, was drawn into the current of theological speculation and controversy. The result of these studies, acting upon a positive

and vigorous mind, was that certain fundamental principles of the Puritan doctrine and organization acquired for him a supreme importance,— so that in his will, bearing date 1750, he gave to Harvard College the sum of £33 6s. 8d., “in like money, . . . for creating, maintaining, supporting, and continuing an anniversary sermon or lecture to be held or preached in the said College once every year successively. . . .

1. “For the proving, explaining, and proper use and improvement of Natural Religion — as it is commonly called and understood by divines and learned men.”

2. “For the confirmation, illustration, and improvement of the great articles of the Christian Religion, properly so called.”

3. “For the detecting and convicting and exposing the Idolatry of the Romish Church, their tyranny, usurpations, damnable heresies, fatal errors, abominable superstitions, and other crying wickedness in their high places, and finally, that the Church of Rome is that mystical Babylon, that man of sin, that apostate church, spoken of in the New Testament.”

4. “For the maintaining, explaining, and proving the validity of the ordination of ministers or pastors of the churches, and so their administrations of the sacraments or ordinances of religion as the same hath been practised in New England from the first beginning of it and so continued to this day.”

In the statement of three of these subjects there is a noticeable calmness and clearness of language. In the wording of the third there is a vehemence and passion which to the ear of our day can sound only grotesque. Evidently, in providing for an exposition of the weak points in the Roman Church, Mr. Dudley was giving expression to most profound convictions. Evidently, he felt, as did many others in his day, the shadow of a danger always impending over the Christian world, so long as the great Roman organization should exist with its present aims and methods. A light is thrown upon Dudley's feeling here by the words of the Introduction to a treatise of his, printed in 1751, on “The Merchandise of Slaves and Souls of Men,— with an application thereof to the Church of Rome.”

He there says: “If any should inquire what occasion there is at this time of the day for an oration against Popery; is the Protestant Interest in any danger from that quarter? I answer: the Church Militant will never be out of danger, and therefore she has Watchmen set upon her walls.” “And though our Lord Jesus Christ will certainly make good his great promise, that the Gates

of Hell shall never be able to prevail against his Church, yet I know of no other Charter that any of the Protestant Churches in particular have for their Security, than what runs with a ‘*quam diu se bene gesserint*,’ or in the words of the Prophet Azariah, ‘The Lord will be with You so long as You be with Him.’” This apology of Dudley in 1731 may perhaps suffice also for the year 1891.

During the years from 1755 to 1857, when the Dudleian Lecture was temporarily suspended to allow the fund, become insufficient, to accumulate, the third subject took its place in the cycle as arranged by the founder, and now again, in the resumption of the foundation, it comes up for treatment in its turn. In its harsh and violent terms it reflects the Puritan spirit of jealous intolerance of all outward spiritual domination. It is the utterance of an age which saw in the Roman organization the chief agency in the repression of that great intellectual ferment out of which the revolutions, political, social, and religious, of the next generation were to be born.

Let us inquire into the causes of that alarm, and ask ourselves whether they have entirely passed away with the growth of liberty and enlightenment.

The lifetime of Paul Dudley covered a period which appears, according to the point of view, as the triumph of Protestantism, or of the Roman Catholic reaction. England, by the great Act of Succession, had secured forever, as far as legal enactment could secure it, a line of Protestant rulers. Northern Germany, rising gradually out of the desolation of the Thirty Years’ War, under the leadership of Prussia, had gained in Frederick II. a man capable of rising above the petty detail of sectarian strife — the man who, by his winged word, “Let every man get to heaven after his own fashion,” had sounded the first note of the gospel of religious toleration. But when we have said this, we have mentioned the only solid guarantees then visible for the future of European liberty. The Low Countries had come out of their magnificent fight with Spanish tyranny burdened with allies who were ready at any moment to become their bitterest foes, and thus bring to naught the great work of enlightenment that had been done there.

France, by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, had, so far as its governing classes were concerned, set itself squarely upon the side of Roman orthodoxy. Spain, just passing over the height of its greatness and sinking into insignificance under the double

burden of Roman Catholicism and a foul administration, had completely purified herself from every taint of heresy, and still maintained her Holy Inquisition, languishing only because its work had already been so thoroughly done.

Italy, only a few generations before the leader of Europe in every field of human effort, — mistress of learning, fertile in political theories, genial in every form of artistic production, leader as well in industry and traffic, — Italy had given up the fight, had surrendered her precious liberties to a band of “legitimated” tyrants, warring with each other, united only in one concerted effort to crush out every motion of the human mind which seemed to threaten that admirable order of which the Roman papacy was the central and controlling figure. Galileo, silenced by the Holy Office, had died just a generation before Paul Dudley was born.

The whole south of Germany, led by Austria and Bavaria, had come out of the Thirty Years’ War determined to wipe out every stain of heresy left upon it by the vigorous local Protestantism of the early Reformation. A dozen years before the birth of Paul Dudley occurred that expulsion of thirty thousand Protestants from the Austrian territory which gave to Goethe, the prophet of a new age, the motive of his most charming poem.

To one looking over the possibilities of the future on both sides of the Atlantic in the year of grace 1750, it must have been perfectly clear that the two great forces were still in conflict, and that the victory of the new, so far as it went, must be won inch by inch from an enemy which had from age to age changed the outward fashion of its weapons, but had not changed in any essential way the spirit which kept these weapons in action. It was, indeed, too late in Paul Dudley’s time for another St. Bartholomew; the New England Puritan had no fear of being murdered in his bed. What he dreaded was a more subtle assault. He saw, still in active operation, as they are to this day, two great agencies of repression, and he knew that one of these at least might gain a foothold in the community he had helped to establish. The Order of Jesuits and the Index of prohibited books, the former especially, were ever present reminders of the attitude assumed by the Church of Rome towards all innovations in matters of thought.

The fear of the Jesuit haunted the Protestant imagination of the eighteenth century. The Puritan saw in him the embodiment of that Rome which had defined itself at the Council of Trent. He knew well the tremendous struggle through which his own

Motherland had passed. He remembered that in the course of that struggle a king and a queen had been sacrificed, and still, though the law was fixed, the conflict was not ended. He dreaded, lest in some unforeseen political combination the great Catholic powers might once again make common cause, and all that England had gained be put at stake anew.

Thus we see that Paul Dudley's vehemence had its roots deep down in the consciousness of his day and of his class. Let us examine a little more carefully — still holding by such threads of historical fact as may most surely guide us — the reasons for this dread. Perhaps nothing will be more serviceable to our purpose than to define as accurately as possible, in the light of a brief historical review, the terms "Catholic" and "Protestant."

We use these terms freely, without often giving ourselves account of what they precisely mean. It helps all our notions to turn, from time to time, away from the heat of controversy and the confusion of partisan definitions, and, in the calm, cool atmosphere of simple historical inquiry, to set ourselves right upon fundamental points.

To go back for a moment to the very earliest stages of the Christian organization, we are forced to admit that, for a long time, — for two or three hundred years at least, — it was not at all clear what Christianity was or was going to be, either as to its doctrine or as to its discipline. There were, almost from the beginning, two chief directions of opinion on these points. There were those to whom Christianity seemed to be only a new system of philosophy, trying to make a place for itself by the side of Epicureanism and Stoicism and New-Platonism and all the rest. Naturally these were what we should call "the best minds" among Christians, — men who thought that they could take the central idea of Christianity, the salvation of the world by a God-man, and by grafting this on to prevailing systems of thought produce the final philosophy, a philosophy so complete as to embrace all the others, and make all future speculation needless. Such men were called, or called themselves, Gnostics, the "knowing ones," and their Christianity was a lofty abstraction. If it had prevailed, there would have been one more philosophy to study, but surely we, descendants of northern barbarians, should never have been Christians.

Then there were others, men of feeling, as the former were men of thought, who said that Christianity was essentially a thing of special divine inspiration to the individual. Far from being a

philosophy it was a breath of the divine Spirit, moving as it would, employing the humblest as well as the highest agencies, speaking truth out of the ecstatic utterances of certain men and women, and calling upon all believers to gather about these chosen agents of the divine will. Whatever tended to put any limitation upon the free working of this Holy Spirit, be it the reason of man, the written word, or the rules of any human institution, must be, in so far, hostile to that which was essentially Christian.

This is the theory of Christianity known, from that day to this, in its countless manifestations, as the "Montanistic." If it had prevailed, Christianity would simply have taken its place among the other fanaticisms of the world; its priests would have been howling dervishes; its membership would have been limited to a little community of saints, and its standard of authority would have been the loose interpretation of oracles more fantastic than those of Greece and Rome.

These two principles, the gnostic and the spiritual, starting from utterly opposed ideas, contained curious elements of similarity. Church membership, according to either, must necessarily have been limited, and even within this limit there was another, an esoteric membership, the brotherhood of the wholly learned or of the wholly spiritual. Each contained, also, the germ of that ascetic ideal, which, essentially unchristian in its origin and its spirit, succeeded, nevertheless, in stamping itself upon the church, and, during a thousand years, dominated the imagination of Europe.

But, happily for the future of Christianity, there appears from the beginning of our knowledge as to its workings a third tendency, which I may describe as the educational. According to this view Christianity was to be thought of as a great scheme for the moral and spiritual regeneration of all men everywhere. It was not a philosophy; it was not a scheme of perfection for a community of more than human beings. It was an institution of men, ordinary mortals, joined by a common belief into a great organization for the salvation of souls,—not of some souls, but of all souls, good, bad, and indifferent. Its membership was to be limited only by the limits of humanity. It could have no esoteric membership, for all Christians were alike in the fundamental fact that all had been redeemed from sin and its consequences by the new covenant of the God become Man.

If it be proper to call the first of our three groups the Gnostic or Learned Church, and the second the Spiritual, or Puritan

Church, it becomes very clear to us why the third was early called the Catholic Church. It stood for that view of Christianity which demanded for it universal acceptance, as it offered to men a universal share in its benefits. If Christianity was to become a regenerating and reviving force among men who had lost hold upon the ancient faiths and were groping about darkly for some new foundation on which they might build, this view, and no other, was the one which promised a future to the nations.

A philosophy could not satisfy the East, already sick from too much philosophy; Rome, dominant throughout the West, had never had a head for that intellectual hair-splitting which was as the breath of life to the Greek, and centuries must pass before the great barbarian masses, already hovering upon the horizon of both the Greek and the Roman world, could be taught what a philosophy was.

Almost the same might be said of the spiritual or Puritan view. The doctrine of specific revelation carried its own destruction with it. Men had not deserted the shrine of Apollo to take up with the ravings of Montanus, or of any mad follower of his, who might claim for himself or herself the prophetic gift.

Leaders were wanted, but *such* leaders could not claim the allegiance of men. So far as the Eastern world was concerned, the solution of the problem was to be sought by the method of stormy partisan warfare, with no better centre of authority than the corrupt and fickle court of Constantinople. In the West it early became evident that much, if not all, depended upon the attitude of Rome. Her preëminence in the West was marked as was that of no city in the East. The Western populations, as inferior in culture to the Romans as the Romans were inferior to the Greeks, and accustomed to receive from Rome all that pertained to their higher life, laws, manners, art, discipline, turned naturally to her for leadership in religion as well.

I know of few things in history more impressive than the consistent and determined energy with which Rome faced this great demand. While the Eastern church was tearing itself to pieces in the warfare of endless sects, Rome was calmly taking one side and sticking to it. The great dispute of Arian *vs.* Athanasian found hardly an echo in the West. Rome saw from the beginning where the promise of the future lay, and quietly took her place on the winning side.

While Oriental fanatics, giving literal interpretation to certain words of Jesus, were living in hourly expectation of that second

coming of his which should be the end of this world and the beginning for them of a new era of blessedness which they had not earned, Rome was calmly putting her house in order for a long life here on earth among all men everywhere.

Out of the dense fog of vague tradition and deliberate fabrication which envelops the early history of the western patriarchate one thing shines out clear to brilliancy, — Rome, never the parent of great ideas, never the fountain of generous enthusiasms, was still the most effective agent in marshaling the real forces of Christianity into line of battle with the evils of society. That same quality which had made Rome once mistress of the civilized world in arms and in law came now again into play, making her the guide in this new and greater conquest.

Let us notice one or two illustrations.

In the cruel stress of persecution it could not fail to happen that many a poor soul, half convinced perhaps at the best, or drawn by conflicting motives of duty, made his peace with the authorities as best he might, and saved his life. Then when the storm had passed, and he came to himself again, he naturally sought a reinstatement in the Christian community. How should such an one be met? The sterner critics would have closed the doors upon him, or have opened them only upon hard conditions. Rome said: "No; Catholic is Catholic; if this frail human being sincerely desires to try his fortune with us again, let him in, in God's name, and give him his chance once more."

So, again, in a still more doubtful case: In the multitude of sects, each claiming the name of Christian, it must often have been the case that a man received into the church by some body of believers described as "heretical" would claim Christian fellowship with others defining themselves as "orthodox." There must be some rule to govern his admission. Where should we, knowing the later history of the "only saving church," expect to find her in this matter? It was a bitter struggle, involving the whole Western church in schism and loss of influence; but out of the struggle Rome came forth committed to that grandly catholic view which prevailed, that, no matter how a man had got into the church, if he renounced his errors and sincerely desired fellowship, the taint of an heretical baptism should not prevent his reception to the full enjoyment of Christian privileges.

By this liberal and truly catholic policy, the bishopric of Rome won its place in the regard of the Western world, and profited thenceforth by every turn of affairs to increase its hold upon the

allegiance of men. Its claims upon the gratitude of the world for this vigorous leadership are enough to entitle it to every respect. If it had been content to rest upon these claims and make them the basis of its demands, it seems, humanly speaking, as if it might have gained a lead in the religious advancement of Europe, which would always have been gladly acknowledged and easily maintained.

If, for example, we set aside, once for all, the childish fables of the Petrine supremacy as unworthy the serious thought of sober men, and look at the Roman bishopric as it was at the time when England first came under its direct influence, we get an indication of what a noble function awaited it. The papacy of Gregory the Great, at the beginning of the seventh century, represents an ideal of Rome as the spiritual guide of Western Christendom, not as its dictator. The churches of England and of the Frankish state were then truly national churches, working out upon their own lines the redemption of a barbaric society. Everywhere guidance and direction from Rome; nowhere, as yet, domination.

Then came the splendid development of the Frankish people, culminating in the European empire of Charlemagne. Again we catch a glimpse of what Europe might have had,—a great Christian state, completely independent of the papacy in all its own affairs, yet appealing to it with profound respect upon all religious questions,—even then not bound by its decisions, but frankly repudiating them, when it did not approve them.

But what were the conditions of life for either of these ideals, for either a group of independent national churches, or a single imperial church? Clearly that the political power should remain in the hands of men conscious of the danger which might threaten them from Rome and determined to resist it at all hazards,—supported, further, in this resistance, by the leading forces of their own peoples. Now the ninth century offered precisely the opposite of these conditions. The nominal rulers of Europe, the enfeebled descendants of Charlemagne, were conspicuously incapable men; its actual rulers, the great military aristocracy, were wholly absorbed in building up the feudal framework of mediaeval society, while at the same time the affairs of the papacy were passing into exceptionally vigorous hands.

It seemed as if all the foundations of Europe were being broken up. The idea of centralization of power, which had seemed to prevail in the empire of Charlemagne and to be the natural inheritance of the new kingdoms, was everywhere giving way before

the new principle of feudalism, whereby every landholder was coming to feel himself a sovereign within his limits. While the doctrine of the inheritance of fiefs was becoming everywhere fixed, the inheritance of kingdoms was being everywhere repudiated. An hereditary nobility must necessarily come to feel itself more permanent than a merely elective monarchy.

Then came a curious reaction of the political upon the ecclesiastical life. The principle of nationality, weakened at every point, lost its hold upon the church as well. What was there to take its place? Again we must seek an analogy in politics. The feudal imagination, leaping over the narrower limits of nationality, found a singular comfort in that political chimera, the Holy Roman Empire. So the church, passing all limits of race and political allegiance, found its strength and support in the grand ideal of the Roman papacy.

It is at this point that the definition of the word "catholic," which we have thus far followed, deserts us. The papacy of Gregory the Great ceases to be, and gives place to a new conception. Henceforth the church of Europe stands committed to a theory of papal control, unknown to the earlier time, and to be known in history as the "Decretal System,"—that is, a sovereignty founded upon the authority of so-called "Decretals," or edicts of the popes. The Catholicism of the Middle Ages cannot be understood without a clear conception of what this decretal system implied.

Admitting the necessity of organization in the church, it is evident that this organization might have assumed various forms, determined by the principle of authority, which should prevail. There might have been a congregational system, corresponding to a democratic society, or a conciliar system, corresponding roughly to an aristocracy in politics, or an ecclesiastical monarchy, answering to a highly concentrated political system. Down to the ninth century there had been room in Europe for any one of these systems, and in fact all three were more or less well represented. The rising nationalities had already developed the conciliar theory into effective practice, and, while admitting the guidance of the Roman papacy on the one hand, had on the other allowed an almost dangerous independence of individual churches. A healthful variety, we should say, which ought to have had good results in stimulating activity by every possible means.

But now this national principle, holding a middle ground between Congregationalism, on the one hand, and a strongly cen-

tralized church monarchy on the other, was growing hourly weaker, as the feudal principle grew stronger. It could no longer stand as a bar to Roman pretensions, and Rome, under the leadership of Nicholas I., was ready for its opportunity.

The monumental witness to this new development is found in that most stupendous of the many forgeries by which Rome imposed upon the mediaeval imagination, the "Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals." Evidently, if the principle of papal authority was to be made the sole resort for the government of the church, this authority must be traced as far back as possible. The argument of "as it was in the beginning" was the most powerful conceivable. To clinch this argument for the decretal principle, it was necessary to point to a series of decretals, or papal enactments, reaching back to the beginning. Unfortunately there were no such documents in existence dating from a time earlier than about the year 300. Here was an obstacle, but a slight one. If such documents were demanded in the interest of the Christian world, they must be produced; if they could not be found, they must be fabricated.

I am well aware that the elevation of the Roman primacy may not have been the main purpose of the authors of this great deception, but, practically, its effect was to give to the most extreme claims of the papacy a legal foundation, which had hitherto been lacking. Henceforth, in every case of doubt, the Bishop of Rome needed only to point to this unquestioned record of precedents, which, liberally interpreted, gave to him almost unlimited control over all the interests, political as well as moral and religious, of the European world. How thoroughly this programme was carried out, the history of Gregory VII., Innocent III., and Boniface VIII. is ample evidence.

I have said that this principle of authority was unquestioned. So far as that applies to the canonical precedents gathered in the Isidorian forgeries, it is true; but it would be far from true to say that the claims thus raised were not opposed. Advanced as they were in the beginning to meet a certain opposition, they continued always to call forth new protests, which, however, until the time of the Protestant revolution, they were always able to overcome. To go no farther back than the time of Dante, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, we find in his famous treatise, "De Monarchia," a conception of an universal empire, which should be entirely independent of papal dictation, while at the same time guaranteeing to the church organization the fullest

exercise of its religious function. A few years later appears that singular group of writers, gathered at the court of the Emperor Louis of Bavaria, for the express purpose of defending the rights of the civil state as against the invasion of the organized priesthood under the leadership of Rome. Even so mighty a force as the Franciscan Order, the pet of the papal household, found itself compelled to lend all its great influence to the defense of the same cause.

Here begins the appeal to and the demand for a general council, to be summoned by the papacy, if possible; if not, then by some lay power, having the will and the force necessary to command the attention of Europe. For a hundred years this cry for a council which might take into consideration all the manifest evils of the papal system goes on, resisted steadily by the papal power itself, because it saw that if it should yield for one moment the principle that it, and it alone, had the right to the final word in all human affairs, the prestige of centuries would be gone, and the earlier principle of authority, the right of a representative body, would infallibly assert itself.

The issue of this great struggle of principle between the decretal idea and the conciliar idea is the best proof of the tremendous hold of the papal system on the mind of Europe. At the beginning of the fifteenth century the papacy had just passed through the open scandals of a seventy years' residence in France, under the dictation of the French kings, and for a generation past had involved the church in all the confusions, and still worse scandals, of a double, then finally of a triple, schism. It seemed as if the patience of Europe, especially of the northern countries, had had all it could possibly bear. The first enthusiasm of that splendid revival of ancient learning, which was to give a new content and a new motive to its intellectual life, had prepared men's minds to be shocked by the disparity between the actual and the ideal papacy. The spectacle of two or even three divinely commissioned vicars of Christ, overlooking all their proper functions in the more pressing business of anathematizing each other, exhausting the resources of the faithful in a frantic effort to maintain themselves in power, was too much. The ablest leaders in the church determined to put an end to the situation. England, France, and Germany united in a vigorous effort to bring out the council into its proper place as the only effective reforming agency. They saw the evil, and protested as they could,—but note the result.

At the first council, held at Pisa, in 1409, two rival popes having promised to retire, a third was elected, not by the council, but by cardinals, and the unity of the church appeared to be restored. But, no sooner was this new Pope dead, and a successor to him put forward, a scheming politician, stained with every crime, than the two former popes reasserted their claims, and the state of things was worse than before. Then came the Council of Constance, the first north of the Alps, brought about, not by the papal party, but by the irresistible indignation of the North, finding its voice in the Emperor Sigismund. Again a new Pope was chosen, this time by a combination of cardinals and members of the council. The schism was ended,—heresy, in the person of John Hus, was disposed of,—but how about the great reforms, for which chiefly the council had assembled? The papal party declared that now there was but one Pope again, the reforms were his affair, and the first reform he accomplished was to send the council home.

All the efforts of the best churchmen in Europe, seconded by the authority of the empire and of the national states, to bring the conciliar principle into effective action, had simply ended in establishing, still more firmly than ever, the opposing principle of the decretal system. Christendom had gained one Pope in place of three, but, curiously enough, that very fact was at once made use of to strengthen the hold of the institution at its centre. Still, the impulse to protest, once aroused, could not easily be repressed. The execution of John Hus, at Constance, had kindled a flame in Bohemia which not all the resources of empire and papacy combined could quench, and once again a council came to the rescue. Again it met in opposition to the papal will, and again it was on Germanic soil. At Basel the election of a Pope, which the Council of Pisa had committed to the cardinals and that of Constance had only partially assumed, was frankly taken in hand by the council itself.

This was an innovation which might have been the starting-point of a reform that would have made the Protestant revolution unnecessary. A Pope elected by representatives of all the nations, sitting, not by papal appointment, but by right, as the makers of opinion on church law and polity,—this was a very different thing from a Pope elected by a limited body of cardinals appointed by the papacy itself, and committed from the start to maintain its policy.

Here was a splendid opportunity for Europe. The material

for a reform of the church in head and members was all at hand. No element of such a reform was wanting except the power on the part of those most concerned to recognize the real issue. Men refused to understand that all effort was but wasted, so long as the foundation principle of the decretal system of authority was left intact. If one looks only to the immediate results upon the papacy itself, one is tempted to believe that all the effort of the three great councils had been thrown away.

The hundred years following the Council of Basel are the most brilliant in the papal history. They correspond to the period of the Old Régime in France. In this interval, the papacy identified itself as never before with the life of the world about it. It was a territorial state among others, and its rulers were princes among others, increasing and defending their territories by the same means, making up for the lack of legitimate descendants by providing on a liberal scale for their relatives and their bastards. The papacy, as Luther said afterwards, built a triple wall about itself, so that it could not be assailed, and the foundation of this triple wall was the principle that it alone, of all earthly institutions, had the sole right of judging its own misdeeds. Admit this, the logical outcome of the decretal theory, and all criticism becomes impiety, all opposition becomes treason, and all divergence heresy.

I am aware that this decretal principle may be expressed in quite other words than those I have employed. It is not unusual to hear that the essential idea of the Roman Church is that of a continuing and progressive divine revelation of truth to men, as opposed to that of a single divinely inspired book, or the unaided voice of human reason. There is something very attractive in that idea of a continuing revelation. If we compare it with that of a single authoritative Scripture, literally interpreted, it is full of life and promise. If we compare it with that of the sole authority of human reason, it seems to offer a supremely useful check upon the vagaries of the individual mind. It is a principle which Protestants have been all too prone to neglect, and towards which they have again and again been forced to struggle up out of the errors into which such neglect has led them.

But — and this seems to me the gist of the whole matter — to assert a continuing divine revelation of the truth to men is one thing, and to claim this revelation as the sole property of any human institution is quite another. In so far as the Church of Rome has defended the cause of humanity against the cruel literal-

ness of Calvinism and the later Lutheranism, or against the wild vagaries of Montanism, in all its forms, we owe it profound gratitude ; but, on the other hand, in so far as it has ignored the principle of life and progress, which runs through all these diversities of interpretation, it has, historically speaking, been a burden and a drag upon advancing humanity.

We have thus traced the growth of the central idea of Roman Catholicism, the Decretal System, down to the point where it was to be put upon its defense more distinctly than ever before, and come now to consider historically the development of the Protestant principle as we have done that of the Catholic.

At first thought, it seems like a well-nigh hopeless task to discover any principle whatever in the mass of contending sects into which Protestants have divided, and, indeed, one might well despair of success, if one did not believe that through all these diversities there run certain common lines of agreement, more important than the differences, so important, in fact, as to make the differences insignificant.

The first principle which I should describe as a Protestant one is that of hostility to any form of mechanical religion, the interposing of any necessary barriers between the human soul and the God whom it desires to worship. From my own study of the Reformation, there remains no impression clearer than this, that the aim of the reformers was not primarily the removal of external abuses in the church. That such abuses existed was patent to every one, and no historian has yet been found bold enough to deny them. Priests led evil lives without rebuke ; enormous impositions of money were laid upon the peoples of Europe to maintain an army of idle or half-employed mendicants in ease or luxury ; a shameless traffic in all sacred things had become so much a thing of custom that men generally failed to see its enormity. All these were visible evils, and they had been attacked by faithful friends of the church from Dante down. Even the papacy had from time to time roused itself from its wars, its politics, its building, its patronage of learning and art, to take notice of one or another gross violation of morality or of canonical precedent. The striking thing is that, so long as the reformatory efforts proceeded on these lines of outward improvement, it was ineffectual. Even so clear a head as Erasmus, the brightest intellect of his day, failed to grasp this point. He scourged the church with the lash of his wit and his learning, but he did not touch that deeper spring, waiting to respond to the hand which should discover it.

I emphasize this point because the latest systematic historical defense of the Roman system, that of Janssen and Pastor, proceeds precisely on this line: that the Reformation was a colossal mistake; that the evils of the church, which no one admits more frankly than they, were all in a fair way to be removed by the simple process of letting the good have its own way; that revolution simply produced confusion and violence, obscured the real points at issue, and lamed for generations those noble activities which were already doing so much towards bringing about a new and better time.

The answer to this is twofold. It is found first in the swift response of the conscience of Northern Europe to the great word of Luther, "The just shall live by faith," and it is found again in the reply of the Roman organization, through the Council of Trent, to the challenge it had received.

That word of Luther had often been spoken before, but never with such direct appeal as now. Men seemed to feel that here was offered them instantly the key to the whole problem. They no longer needed to look to Pope or Council to mediate between them and God, — a new principle of thought and action had been furnished them which they could apply to every evil of the religious life and expect a remedy. Wherever this principle was accepted, the whole great machinery of a mechanical salvation fell to pieces as if by magic.

Throughout northern Germany, thence to Denmark, Scandinavia, England, Holland, and Switzerland, a revolutionary impulse carried away the leaders of the nations. Even the more southern peoples were roused enough to excite the alarm of all their rulers, and urge them to measures of reaction. The swiftness of this answer to the word of Luther shows that it had a new meaning for men. It proves that they had despaired of reaching a solution of the religious problem by the ordinary methods of peaceful reform. They remembered the results of the age of the councils; they remembered John Hus and Savonarola; they saw what an effective machinery had gone into operation to crush out in its beginnings every form of protest, and they believed that the only method left was that of revolution. Within eight years from the publication of Luther's theses against indulgences, those nations of Europe which were to be the leaders of reform had already declared themselves. It was not the reform of this or that outward evil that was now demanded; it was a complete denial of the Roman principle of authority, and the substitution therefor of some other standard.

This seems to me the first proof that the Roman system would never have reformed itself. The second is in the Council of Trent. If it be true that the dominant forces in the church of the sixteenth century were working in the direction of a purer and higher conception of religion, we should expect to find these forces welcoming the efforts, even though hasty and violent, of more eager reformers. We should expect to find a great moderate party, which would gladly go half way in meeting this new enthusiasm, as the Roman organization had already met and utilized so many other enthusiasms, and in shaping it to the good of Christian Europe. Nor are we wholly disappointed. There was a great moderate party, headed by the purest elements of the Italian church, which was willing to go as far as possible in meeting the demand of the reform for a general council, and in harmonizing what might prove after all to be only minor differences. But what was the result? From the first call of Luther for a general council to the first meeting of the Council of Trent was a generation of men, and it was twenty years longer before the council could be brought to formulate its position on the burning questions of the conflict. Not until the forces of conciliation had spent their strength in hopeless struggle, and the papacy found itself strengthened by a new impulse of reactionary zeal, did it allow its position to be declared.

And what was this position as the result of internal reformatory action? A few of the outward evils of the clerical life and of church administration were disposed of, so far as words could do it, but upon all those fundamental points against which the protest of the Reformation had been directed, the Council of Trent reasserted everything. Above all, the Decretal Principle, by which the papacy was made the one central authority in all matters of church doctrine and discipline, was absolutely maintained.

The Council of Trent, which has given the tone to the Roman institution to this day, fell back absolutely upon that idea of a specific revelation, placed in its sole charge, which lay at the bottom of the Isidorian system. All the great movements of human thought, which make the era of the Reformation the most interesting, as it is the most important in European history, were deliberately repudiated. The printing-press, which had already shown its enormous power during the religious conflict, was henceforth to be absolutely under the control of the organized priesthood. The order of Jesuits, devoted by its very nature to the

blind service of the papacy, was confirmed in its organization, and endowed with privileges which were to become practically unlimited. The Holy Inquisition, already beginning its hideous career of purification, was recognized and confirmed as the most effective weapon against the action of the human mind. It is not to our purpose to criticise these methods. Repression was the natural attitude of authority in the sixteenth century, and it was applied by one and another party as it saw its opportunity. But it is the gloomy distinction of the Roman Church to have reduced repression to a system. These were not the mad excesses of a reckless tyrant like Henry VIII. of England, nor an outbreak of dogmatic zeal such as inspired the Genevan church, in the burning of Servetus, but the deliberate expression of the highest will, in an institution claiming divine authority for its acts. They were the declaration, not of a momentary attitude, but of a policy for all time to come, and that policy has been faithfully adhered to.

Henceforth the issue was clearly defined: on the one hand an elaborate mechanical system of intermediary agencies, through which alone salvation to the individual and to the community was possible; on the other, in spite of all diversities, the principle of a direct relation between the individual human soul and the God whom it would fain understand better and worship more devoutly.

The second principle, which I should describe as Protestant, is the right of diversity, as opposed to the Catholic principle of the absolute necessity of uniformity. Unquestionably there was a time when it was as useful for the church to live up to certain uniform standards, as it is for an army in the field to wear a uniform dress, and to move according to a prescribed system of tactics. During that time the Catholic principle found its proper application, and did its great work; but that time passed. Men began to demand free play for the individual mind, and then it was that the demand for uniformity began to clog the wheels of human progress.

Then came Protestantism, divided from the very beginning into different lines of activity, yet united in the common aim of helping the world toward clearer conceptions of its highest interests. Their quarrel with Catholicism was not a doctrinal one. It is a fact too easily forgotten, that with the exception of those movements known as Unitarian, Protestantism accepted every one of the fundamental doctrines of the church from which it seceded. The real point of division was, that men would no longer agree to submit their opinions to the dictation of any one single authority.

Undoubtedly Protestantism has had its own follies and weaknesses to answer for. The great principle I am trying to define was anything but clearly defined in the minds of its greatest leaders. Each of its groups believed itself to have discovered the one true way of differing from the common antagonist, and was inclined to emphasize its diversities from its allies even more sharply than those which separated it from Rome. "Rather than say with the fanatics," said Luther, speaking of the Eucharist, "that it is nothing but bread, I would say with the papists, that it is nothing but flesh."

True it is, again, that Protestants were as eager to build their opinions upon some authority as ever Rome had been. True that they put forward the authority of a written book, which could not be changed, and which, therefore, seemed to bind them to a more cruel and rigid literalness than ever. But, in fact, this very literalness destroyed itself. Men at once began to interpret for themselves the meaning of this book, and along the line of this study and interpretation of the documentary evidence of Christianity, they came out into the clear light of modern scientific calmness and confidence.

It was idle for men who had taken the early steps along the road of a reasonable religion to demand that no one should dare to go beyond them. The impulse once given could not be checked, and therefore it is that Protestants may, with entire confidence, maintain that all the energy of modern, as distinguished from mediæval life is inseparably connected with their attitude towards the whole body of attainable truth. Deny the right of diversity ; insist that only in uniformity is safety ; refuse to the individual soul its right to approach the source of its higher life without human mediation, and the modern world, with all its achievements of the human will, would disappear, and the scheme of Hildebrand would be the only one suited to the state of society that would ensue.

We are living to-day in an era of good feeling. Enthusiasm for religious beliefs is unfashionable. We feel that the truly religious man is he who contributes most to the present welfare of humanity, and we declare that the really important thing is the common content of religious sects rather than their points of difference. We say, lightly perhaps, that dogmas have had their day, and can never again assert their power over the minds of men.

In all this there is a something splendid which may, in a few
VOL. XVII. — NO. 90. 17

choice spirits, arouse a new enthusiasm in place of the old, — the enthusiasm of humanity. But it would be idle to blind ourselves to the fact that superiority to dogmas may be, after all, only indifference, both to the dogmas and to the greater truths which they represent. For what are these dogmas of the sects but the crystallized thought of ages upon the profoundest problems of man's nature, and his relation to the universe which surrounds him? They have become contemptible only because they have so often obscured the greater truths instead of illuminating them.

The real problem of our day in this matter is to be solved, not by despising dogmas, but by understanding them. Men will demand support in their beliefs; and if we say, dogmas are no longer worth our serious thought, we may be sure that those organizations which have not lost respect for their own dogmas will attract to themselves ever-increasing masses of those who find in them even an apology for a support to their unaided thought.

The conflict of the early church is repeating itself in our midst. Now, as then, we see a great Gnostic element, declaring itself the true interpreter of Christianity through the medium of the intellect. Now, as then, we have our element of ecstatic fervor, proclaiming from time to time a direct revelation of divine truth through the medium of some inspired prophet, a new manifestation of the Eternal Logos.

And so, again, we have in our own day the great theory of a Catholic Church, — not a church of the learned, not a community of saints, but the Church of Christ, existing, a new pedagogue, to lead men from the life of the body into the life of the spirit. But where is this Catholic Church of our time? I hold it to be the chief sin as well as the chief weakness of Rome to-day, that it still claims for itself the sole possession of that title, — just as it would be a sin and an unfailing source of weakness in any other body which should claim it for itself.

In defining the true Catholic principle, we must go back again to the early time of Christianity, when this incubus of the decretal theory had not yet fastened itself upon it, when Rome guided the nations, because it had really something to offer them; because Rome actually was the mediator between the civilization of the past and a new half-barbarous Europe. The mission of Rome ceased when Europe had learned to think for itself. The Reformation was Europe's proclamation of its majority.

At the opening of the Council of Trent there was yet time for that early definition of "Catholic" to be reasserted by the Roman

organization itself. At the close of that council, twenty years afterward, it was too late. From that time to this the Catholic principle has found its true expression in no single source, but throughout the Christian community, wherever men have risen above the interests of sects and classes to that original conception of Christianity as giving to all men, everywhere, a higher and truer idea of God, — a more profound sense of man's relation to God, — define Him as men will, — and a more effective love for his fellow-men.

Of that Catholicism, this University has no fear. Against any narrower definition, — especially against any definition which places a limit upon the right and the duty of every man to seek for truth wherever and however he can and will, — she will protest in the future as she has protested in the past.

E. Emerton.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

VIEWS OF DR. A. BAER ON DRUNKENNESS.

THE simplest things are not the most simple when studied. The good and sincere total-abstinence advocate has a high moral aim in view, and shows his loyalty by his sacrificial spirit, and thinks his case so clear and simple that he never doubts it.

To insist on total abstinence from wine in France and beer in Germany is like objecting to the use of coffee and tea in England or America. The question of total abstinence is manifestly a local one; it is relative to the country, or even state, city, or town. To insist that drinking is either right or wrong in the absolute sense is an attempt to make the relative absolute, which is a contradiction. There are two distinct questions, the purely ethical and the purely scientific; and while they are separated for convenience, they are in reality together, for in the end the facts decide the "ought." The practical ethical question seems to turn on this point: to what extent the use of a thing should be prohibited when it is abused. Many ethical difficulties are not between good and evil, but between two evils, as to which is the lesser.

It will be interesting to follow one of the recent European investigators, Dr. A. Baer,¹ of the Imperial Board of Health, and Chief Prison Physician at Berlin.

¹ *Die Trunksucht und ihre Abwehr*, von Dr. A. Baer. Wien und Leipzig, 1890.

In the past, wine was used almost wholly by the well-to-do classes, and beer was of such a nature that harm was out of the question. Excessive use of alcohol first began with the art of distillation, and with the obtaining of strong concentrated whiskey from corn, potatoes, and the like. With the universalizing of the use of whiskey, a series of phenomena have appeared, which are designated by the word "alcoholism."

The climate is an important factor. Drunkenness is more frequent in cold than in warm countries, and is more brutal and injurious in its effects as we go north. Yet this is not always true, for within the last ten years alcoholism has greatly decreased in Sweden, and increased in southern France and northern Italy. In tropical regions it is at present spreading fast, and with great injury, especially in newly-discovered lands. The accustoming one's self to the use of alcohol causes, sooner or later, a feeling of need for it; alcoholism is not, therefore, an inborn instinctive need, but an acquired one. Experience teaches that the longer this vice exists in a nation the greater the vice becomes. Persons who misuse alcoholic drinks, especially whiskey, often become sick and die sooner than the moderate drinkers and non-drinkers. When alcohol is taken habitually, and when misused, it injures the whole constitution: all tissues and organs, and especially the blood, suffer sooner or later a pathological change, with which susceptibility to disease is increased. Alcohol intoxication not only calls out diseases and disturbances that the non-drinker does not have, but it gives rise to a greater morbidity. It is an old experience that in epidemics of cholera, dysentery, and small-pox, drinkers are attacked in larger numbers, and with greater intensity, than non-drinkers. The bad constitution of the blood, the weakness of the changed heart-muscles, the sunken energy of the nervous functions, and the frequent accompanying disease of the brain, give a bad course to every disease, and a high mortality. The greater mortality of drinkers, as compared with non-drinkers, is shown by the figures of the "United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Association," an insurance company founded since 1847:—

Year.	TOTAL ABSTAINERS.		GENERAL DIVISION.	
	Deaths Expected.	Actual Deaths.	Deaths Expected.	Actual Deaths.
1866-70	549	411	1008	944
1871-75	723	511	1268	1330
1876-80	933	651	1485	1480
1881-85	1179	835	1670	1530
1886-87	553	390	713	700
	3937	2798	6144	5984

In the "Total Abstainers' Division," 71 per cent. of the expected deaths occurred ; in the "General Division," 97 per cent. Other companies give similar figures.

Sweden, which, up to recent times, was considered the most drunken land, owed this state of things principally to the excess of small saloons and to a very small tax on whiskey. The great decrease in the number of these saloons, in connection with an increase of the whiskey tax and with a temperance movement, has lessened drunkenness to a great extent. As the use of whiskey decreased, the number of sick and dead from alcoholism lessened also. In Norway, also, a bad legislation had a similar effect in spreading drunkenness. With the decrease of consumption of whiskey, that of beer increased ; and no land has shown more improvement through the decrease of drunkenness than Norway. In Russia, the alcohol consumption is great in certain parts, but in Russia as a whole, it is not so considerable as one would expect from the amount of alcoholism. The results of the abuse of alcohol are in a great measure due to the climate and the social condition of the masses. Besides the raw climate, there is an insufficient nourishment, almost wholly vegetable, which drives to whiskey ; which is not taken in small quantities, and regularly, as in other nations, but seldom, and in large quantities, on holidays (ninety-six yearly), in family celebrations, in market-days. Recently, alcoholism has decreased. In Holland, with its wet, foggy climate, and great number of seaports, there has always been a large consumption of alcohol, increased by the exceedingly large number of licensed places, and especially from the fact that whiskey is sold in many kinds of business (baker's, hairdresser's, etc.) ; as a consequence, there is a great increase of insanity through dipsomania and delirium tremens. In France, in former centuries,

alcoholism was hardly known so long as wine was the alcoholic drink. But by the great exportation of wine, and by the recent appearance of oidium and phylloxera, and a like alcohol production from turnips, corn, meal, and potatoes, the alcohol consumption has gradually increased, and its consequent misuse has followed. The consumption of alcohol has more than trebled within fifty-five years. Where wine is least used, there is the greatest consumption of whiskey. The number of suicides is directly proportional to the increase in alcohol consumption. The number of fatal accidents due to alcohol has shown a constant increase.

In Italy, the consumption of alcohol is, on the whole, very small. It is larger in the northern provinces; more recently, it has increased as the consumption of wine has decreased. In Austria, it is a sad fact that the consumption of beer is decreasing, while that of whiskey is increasing. In Germany the consumption of both beer and whiskey has been increasing. The use of beer, as compared with whiskey, varies very much in different provinces of Germany: in the east and northeast much whiskey and little beer; in the west and northwest, much of both; in the south, very little whiskey, but a great deal of beer (Bavaria); the increase of the consumption of whiskey is mainly due to its large production and very great cheapness. The consumption of alcoholic drinks within the last ten years, especially strong drinks, has been aided by the rapid increase in the number of saloons.

The relation between drunkenness and crime is not always a parallel one. Crime is not alone conditioned by the quantity or intensity of intemperance, for it owes its rise to many social conditions also; but all these unfavorable conditions are aided by drunkenness, and in this sense the abuse of alcohol increases crime very greatly. It can be said that with the increase of intemperance and of drinkers (by no means identical with the increase of alcoholism), the number of criminals and crime increases. Misuse of alcohol means poverty and pauperism, which are the main sources of crime. The injury of drunkenness to family life cannot be reckoned, but daily experience teaches that nothing disturbs the family life as much; the boys fall into idleness, slothfulness, and finally into crime; the girls become the booty of prostitution.

Some of the preventive means against intemperance are: (1.) Education of the children of the working-classes in an orderly, industrious, and economic life. (2.) Construction of healthy dwellings for the working-classes, so that an over-crowded room

may no longer encourage the workingman to seek the saloon. (3.) Better food, so that he may not be tempted to make up for this want by a temporary supply of whiskey, which deceives him in causing him to suppose that he is gaining strength. (4.) Public coffee-houses, with home-like surroundings, papers to read, etc., etc. (5.) Formation of temperance societies, which in many ways warn others against the evils of intemperance. While the total-abstinence societies have done much good, yet a very practical organization exists in Switzerland which has three categories of members: (a) Those who are total abstainers; (b) those who take the pledge for a certain length of time; and (c) those who assist the society in a financial way. In this way a unified action can be gained, without losing the aid of those who are in favor of all efforts against the evil of drink, yet are not so rigid personally as to be total abstainers. (6.) The establishment of inebriate asylums, where the habitual drinker may be rescued.

The state should limit the consumption of whiskey to the smallest quantity possible, by (1) the lessening of production, and the imposing of a tax. From experience in Sweden, Norway, Finland, Switzerland, and France, this has lessened the so-called small house-distilleries, which have been one of the greatest causes of house-drunkenness; here whiskey is made for local consumption, and, on account of primitive methods, is of very bad quality. (2.) As to the extreme measure of prohibition, it cannot be carried out in thickly populated States, where the intemperance of the people is really great, and it is not necessary where drunkenness is not extensive among the people. (3.) A high tax on whiskey. The consumption of alcohol increases in proportion to the cheapness of whiskey. (4.) A moderate tax on the lighter alcoholic drinks. Beer is the greatest enemy of whiskey; it must, therefore, be of good quality, and not dear, but strong alcoholic beers should be taxed very high; coffee, tea, chocolate, and all necessary articles of food should be made cheap, and of good quality. (5.) A lessening of the number of licensed places. The need for whiskey is not a natural one, but artificial. To increase the saloons increases the number of drinkers. The whiskey trade does not follow the law of supply and demand, but rather that of demand and supply. The easier it is for every individual to find whiskey at all times, places, and prices, the more he will drink, until it becomes his unconquerable vice. The lessening the number of licensed places, in connection with a high tax on whiskey or other strong drinks, is the best means that the state can em-

ploy for the control and repression of drunkenness, and it is in those lands in which political and industrial freedom is valued the most that the severest measures against the whiskey business are undertaken. (6.) Punishment of the saloon-keeper, when he sells to persons already drunk, or to minors not accompanied by relatives. (7.) Inspection of the liquor traffic, both as to place and time of sale. The sale of whiskey in groceries should be absolutely prohibited, because women with a tendency to drink are here very easy victims.

The repression of public drunkenness by punishment of the drinker has been tried in many countries, but with little success. Many things are forbidden in the interest of public order and well-being, and though not necessarily in themselves immoral, produce conditions which easily lead to immorality, or are otherwise dangerous to society. Yet it is rather cruel to permit saloons at every corner, and cheap whiskey, and then to punish drunkenness.

Measures against the habitual drinker are: (1.) Placing the drinker under guardianship. This course would not differ materially from doing the same in case of the spendthrift and the insane. It would lessen the chances of wife and family becoming paupers, and would not only be for the good of the drinker, but a warning to others. (2.) Placing in inebriate asylums. In the later stages of habitual drunkenness, there is a considerable number of cases of insanity, and the insanity takes the most different forms, as chronic mania, epileptic insanity, delusional insanity, general paralysis, and other phases of incurable insanity. In other cases, alcoholic excess is a symptom of a diseased nervous system, where there was insanity before drinking commenced. In the first stages of mania, melancholia, and general paralysis many are driven to the use of alcohol. Dipsomania is a form of insanity, and is periodic. Besides all these, there are a number of drinkers on the border line between health and disease, who, on account of their inherited mental weakness, and consequent irritableness, through overwork, are given to alcoholic excesses. There are a still greater number of habitual drinkers who are not insane, but, through long abuse of alcohol, cannot resist drinking; they reach such a degree of volitional and intellectual weakness, of irritability and stupidity, indifference to customs and position, and mistrust and carelessness towards their family, that it is a question whether they are not a common danger to society. The number of these persons among those suffering from chronic

alcoholism is by far the greatest, and Gauster¹ says that they are the most dangerous, because their condition is latent, and attacks can appear suddenly. Should such drinkers be left to go free in life?

Arthur MacDonald.

U. S. BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

REFLECTIONS OF A PRISONER.

THE prisoner, who has forfeited so many of the common possibilities of mankind, has still one of them to a rare degree,—that of reflection. Opportunity, as it were, turns her back on him, yet holds out behind her this parting boon. Often it seems anything but a privilege; to me it has proved a call from heaven. And since as a writing man, I was born, not made, it is you that I beg to be my confidants, O pen and paper! Any other confidant of what I am about to say would be impossible.

Though a prisoner, and justly so, I did not come of the so-called criminal classes. My people were staunch New England Puritans. I inherited many of their traits, and was brought up in their traditions. At twenty-five I was what is called a promising young man, vigorous in body and mind, pure in my aspirations, refined in my tastes, and with the beginning of a liberal culture. Neither my family nor myself perceived the dangerous weakness of will which my conduct afterwards revealed. But the Devil did. That is, if there is a Devil. I have never given much attention to the likelihood of his existence, feeling a more pressing need for faith in other directions. But of late, as I have realized the subtle correspondence between our temptations and the natures they beset, the thought that there may be an archtempter has grown upon me.

However that may be, temptation came to me on just the side where I supposed myself secure, in just the form which I least expected, and with the most adroit mode of attack. Had the summons to my final crime been sudden and open, it would have had no allurement for me. A habit of indecision in trifles, of which at that time I was hardly conscious, proved my enemy's strongest ally. In pondering over the matter since, I have come to feel more and more urgently the vital importance of training one's self to firm

¹ *Jahrb. für Psych.* 1839, VIII, Heft III.

decision, followed by prompt action. I have come to understand that every time I, as a boy, lay abed in the morning, speculating as to whether I would get up or not, — every time I yielded to the charms of the doubtful book which I had previously concluded not to read, — every time I followed another person's unwise suggestion because assent was easier than opposition, — I was making myself less incapable of committing a great sin. This might seem to some people overstrained. I know that it is true.

For two or three years I gave way step by step. All the time I kept my allegiance to goodness in feeling if not in action. I said in my heart, "I shall never do that wickedness. I hate it with my whole soul. This strange, new course of mine, which certainly seems as if it might lead other men there, men who had a leaning toward that sort of thing, is safe for me. Moreover, it is justified by my exceptional circumstances. True, I am stepping outside the common track of integrity, but society cannot always judge for the individual. I am a radical. I make my own customs."

Thus did I taste of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Thus did the tempter say to me as to the first transgressor, "Thou shalt not surely die." And thus did I "look on truth askance and strangely."

This last seems to me, after all, one of the most appalling results of sin. Among the deepest instincts of humanity, I take it, is that of loyalty to truth. More and more, as a man grows toward Christlikeness, that is, toward supreme naturalness, the love for truth becomes a passion to him. But as soon as he takes a step towards evil, a dire conflict begins. His righteous instinct and the sophistry with which he tries to justify himself join in mortal combat. As he obstinately supports the sophistry, the instinct is overmastered and trodden down. Then we have the horrible spectacle of a soul which can no longer distinguish between truth and falsehood in itself. At least, so it was with me. I verily believe, as a wise old physician once said to me, that every sinful choice is a step toward insanity. Through all my years of repentance, my spiritual vision has been dimmed and distorted by the shadows of that lying past, which even now are slow to lift.

I experienced, also, a growing isolation. I could not, of course, commune freely with my relatives and near friends, because my "exceptional circumstances" stood in the way. I explained to myself that they could not see things as I did. I laughed and

chatted with my neighbors, feeling all the while that instead of an old acquaintance they were meeting a stranger, — a stranger even to himself. There was a painting in my office of a dear, dead uncle, who had been one of my boyhood's inspirations. In these days, when my glance fell upon it, my heart sank with a sense of its own aloofness from his simple ideals. I had always been a hero-worshiper. Now the great communion of saints, living and dead, seemed as if standing on the other side of a steadily widening abyss.

In proportion as this isolation deepened on the one hand, on the other I came to recognize the latent evil in the world. Surely, cursed are the impure in heart, for they shall see sin. In the faces that I passed on the city streets I read hitherto unnoticed prints of wrong-doing. Casual phrases forced ugly double meanings upon my shrinking ears. Instances of the special crime toward which I was drifting came up with singular frequency in conversation or in the newspapers. I was surrounded by a poisoned atmosphere. "And it is you who have poisoned it!" I cried to my own soul. For I had lost my plain self-respect; willfully deceived, I yet suspected the deception; in my deepest consciousness I loathed the man I had become; truly, it was the very essence of insanity which drove me onward in the face of so many warnings.

At last the crisis came, and I, who had felt so safe, was over-powered in a moment by the mutiny of my own selfish desires, grown to full strength by long indulgence. In that one moment the cup of sorcery from which I had so blindly drunk spent its potency, and I awoke to what I had done. I, trained by such noble teaching, consecrated to such high endeavor; I, who had dared call myself a Christian soldier, and dream of helping on the grand progress of righteousness in the world; I had failed with the worst failure a man can make. I had cheated and ruined a friend who trusted me, and in so doing had foully betrayed the holy cause I had most at heart, had hindered the coming of Christ's kingdom, and stabbed afresh the heart of the Eternal Love. Ah, no one can imagine that depth of anguish save him who has felt it!

Men talk about suffering! I have known, since that fatal day, many of the sorrows which are reckoned great. But its black experience taught me what is the one essential, enduring sorrow, — what hell is. Let men thank God from the depths of any other agony, that it is free from sin!

Of course there was but one thing to do, namely, to give myself up to the authorities. It might be thought that the same overwhelming reaction from my crime which showed me my true character would have had sufficient impetus to drive me to this obvious step; but such was not the case. Not that I was hindered, in the first instance, by the public exposure and shameful punishment whose shadow was already descending upon me. It was rather the terrible habit of indecision, grown almost to a monomania, which kept my will swaying pendulum-like from one perplexity to another.

At last, in my extremity, I resolved to make a clean breast of it to the one man upon earth whom I honored most. He had been my father's pastor and my own; and now, like the aged St. John, added to the burning devotion of an apostle the large charity which comes only with ripe experience. To deserve his friendship had been one of my chief aspirations. Now, seeing clearly all at once the full width of the gulf which separated me from his well-nigh stainless spirit, I yet longed to tell him the whole truth; to be honest with him, at least. I felt sure, also, that his judgment in the matter would be just what my own would have been, if rid of this wayward madness which possessed me, and I fled to him as to my "external conscience." That phrase, stamped upon my memory from a book which I had read long before, repeated itself again and again in my thought of him.

So I told him all. The pain which my recital gave him was evident enough to add to my remorse. What he said was brief and clear. Seeing me still in suspense, he asked me to seek with him the divine enlightenment; and as we rose from our knees I knew that my earthly doom was sealed. It is not easy to explain even yet. But I had thrown my weak will into the current of a stronger one, from which there was no escape; nay, with which mine was even now identifying itself. And I had done so freely, because I knew that this stronger will was in no whit despotic, but was itself ever striving to be absorbed more completely into that Perfect Will which governs all things.

It was late at night when I left him, and I went home with a clear understanding of what I was to do in the morning. But when I was alone in my own room, the billows of my agony overwhelmed me. Exhausted, heart-broken, blinded by sin and maddened by remorse, I asked myself whether there was any hope for me in the universe; whether there was any truth anywhere which made it reasonable for me to seek to save my soul; whe-

ther, of all the sacred teachings which I had heard from infancy, and to which I had tried to shape my boyhood's growth, there was any jot or tittle of which I was so sure that I could rest upon it now. Then through my storm and darkness shone the divine figure of the ever-loving Christ. But about it, in the same moment, gathered the questions and doubts and denials of the ages. I was incapable of reason or discrimination. With an utter sinking of the heart I was yielding myself at last to — who knows what? when there sounded in my soul the simple words of the sweet old record: "He had compassion on them." Yes, He, who at any rate must stand for the best and truest that the world has known, had compassion on them; his whole history evinced it. And it was borne in upon me that He had compassion on me. It was the saving thought of my life. It came to my bleeding spirit like heavenly balm. I lay until morning wholly bereft of strength in body and mind, realizing that I must shortly rouse to the hell of my own making, but realizing, too, that even there the pitying hand of the Christ had found me.

Then I gave myself up. The sense that I could not go backward, that I was held to my course by the iron will of the old pastor behind my own, was an inexpressible relief. Through all the subsequent nightmare of public disgrace, trial, and condemnation, I found it so. But I will not let myself dwell longer upon that time. Its phantoms of misery and shame have come back again and again to lure me to despair. At first I felt that these frightful images were the merited punishment of my sin, and were to be faced as such. But now I see that they are subtle forms of temptation, whether minions of the Devil or expressions of my own worse nature, I know not. Now I accept only the results of those bitterest days of my life, and turn upon the remorseful self-hatred with a "Get thee behind me, Satan!"

I was sentenced to imprisonment for a term of years that leaves me little to hope for when it is ended, so far as this world is concerned, and I came here with no illusions. Once I was constantly looking into the future; now I live rigidly in the present, except for an added sense of the reality of that eternal future which seemed so dim and unessential to my happy childhood. But until this mortal shall put on immortality, I hope for little external change. About me will be the four walls of my cell, or the cheerless monotony of the work-room, with an occasional glimpse of heaven from the prison yard. For the noble companions whom I might have had, I have substituted my silent jailer and the crimi-

nals who are my worthy mates. The grand profession in which I had started, with all its high opportunities for growth and service, is irrevocably sealed to me. I make chairs in the work-room instead. The clean and helpful influence that I might have had among my fellow-men is become an offense and a byword. And yet, I hope; my soul is at peace.

I came here with one settled purpose,—to retrieve, by God's help, such remnants of life as were left me. My experience with the old pastor gave me a clue to the right way. I saw that as my faltering resolution had been made firm in his, so the weakest will could be held to strength and sufficiency by being cast upon the current of God's will, which is ever ready to succor and to support. I saw that my deathful failure had been made through neglecting Him and the voluntary consciousness of my real relation to Him. I threw myself upon his mercy. And though I have not yet learned to maintain that unbroken union with Him which is my soul's supreme desire, I am growing slowly towards it.

The most agonizing thought to me is that of the evil I have wrought, going on in evil consequences, making life harder and truth darker for men yet unborn. In the face of that thought I am powerless. I dare not let myself apprehend it fully. I take it as the most terrible of warnings. I pray God, with all the earnestness of my penitent heart, that, according to the fullest measure of his power, He will convert the evil into good. He knows that I would give my life—twenty lives!—to have it so.

I turn from my wretched self to Him. I have learned something of his ineffable beauty. As a child I feared Him; as a youth I honored Him vicariously in the persons of my saints; as a despairing man I clung to Him; but as a penitent I love Him. I think sometimes of the best people I have known or read of; of their most exquisite and magnanimous deeds; and then I look to Him, as far above them as the heaven is above the earth. I think of Him manifesting his divine tenderness in the life-long, never-failing, transcendent sacrifice of the Christ. I picture to myself, so far as I may, that matchless face, lighted from within by the glory of infinite love and the strength of unbroken self-mastery, and my whole soul becomes one cry of longing toward Him. I think of Him putting his marvelous loveliness into the world of nature, of which I was too true a devotee to be wholly a loser, even within prison walls. I dream of Him dimly along the farthest borders of my thought, a consummate splendor at the centre of all that is, ordering it in an unthinkable intricate har-

mony, governing all intelligences to their own highest ends, drawing all to himself by the sublime fascination of perfect beauty, love, power, affinity. Then, again, I hear this Divine Perfection saying even unto me: "This my son was dead and is alive again; he was lost and is found."

Oh, the rapture of forgiveness! Men who have never known sin and remorse can never know one side of the Father's nature so fully as we, the pardoned. I used to accept it as a form of words, that "He forgiveth all our iniquities;" I used even to apply it to other people; but when it came to my own case, I went to the depths of anguish before I could at all grasp the actual fact. It was too great for me. There are times, even now, when my demon of despair reneweth his assaults upon my heart, when my hold upon the wonderful certainty is shaken. Then I turn to my New Testament, and read those repeated assurances, once a matter of course, now pulsing with life and shining with whitest light: "When he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him." "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." "Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance."

There is in our prison chapel a memorial window, representing the Good Shepherd at just the moment when He has found the wandering sheep, which is caught about the neck by the cruel thorns of a dense thicket. I have seen in my earlier days many pictures of somewhat the same design; but from its application to my own life this one has made an undying impression upon me. I can feel the relentless thorns and the bewilderment of despair. The Shepherd's tender eyes and outstretched hands of help affect me with an almost unbearable pathos of joy. Out of the black core of my sin itself the divine Transmuter has plucked this pure seed of holy experience.

Moreover, in his great bounty He has given me a new understanding of my fellow-men. When I was innocent, or supposed myself so, I believed the good people whom I knew to be incapable of certain depths of sin; the bad people, incapable of certain heights of virtue. The good men's souls were white; the bad men's souls were black. If I have come to a sorrowful sense that the highest among us may possibly fall, I have learned also the great lesson that the worst sinner may, by God's help, attain

purity, and reach the very summits. The white-robed multitude in the Book of the Revelation, the picture and vision of holiness, are those who "have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." When I consider the most hardened criminal in this prison, I dare not in the least look down upon him, for my own wicked deed has taught me my real kinship with him. Nay, if my training had been as evil as his, is there not every likelihood, in the light of that deed, that I should have done worse than he? On the other hand, as I know myself capable of righteousness, and now steadfastly purposed to attain it, capable of loving the Highest, and catching glimpses even of the Beatific Vision, dare I hope less for him, if he lay hold of God's help?

Such thoughts go with me into the routine, the shadow, the disgrace of my daily life. In my little, fettered activities, I try to show to my most merciful Father my sincerity at least. I make my chairs as well as I can; if I can in any way lend a hand to a fellow-prisoner, I am thankful for the chance. I feel my unnatural surroundings dulling all my powers. But my punishment is just; and, as I said, I look far beyond it.

I realize constantly that I am started upon an eternal life. My weary prison days are to me only a brief delay, a lesson in patience, before the doors are flung wide into an endless possibility. I dare not outline to myself what duties, what disciplines, what clear visions, what reunions, what crowned cups of joy I shall find there, but I know that the Lord of that future is the inexpressibly dear Lord of this present, and that whatever He has in store for me will be best.

PESSIMISM'S PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS TO THE MINISTRY.

"My child, thou art born to endure: therefore endure, suffer, and keep silence."

With these words, it is said, the Mexican people were accustomed to counsel their children and youth. This is but one instance of that practical recognition of the suffering of earthly existence which has always been so real a factor in the experience of men.

In our century, this conviction has been embodied in systematic form by the so-called pessimistic philosophy. Of Schopenhauer, its great representative, we often read and hear. But it is not often that attention is drawn to the emphasis which Schopen-

hauer's philosophy, by both contrast and agreement, places on the fundamental principles of our Christian religion. It is this—and especially the emphasis of agreement—that I have now in mind.

Many will remember the metaphysical basis which underlies the pessimistic conception of life. All that we need here is a glance at its fundamental theses, which, very briefly, are these: Space and time are subjective forms of the receptive intellect. Intellect is a function of the brain. The principle of sufficient reason is the form of the understanding in all being, becoming, knowing, and acting. This world is idea or representation: it is phenomenal,—continually becoming and passing away. But the world is not only idea: an ineradicable conviction assures us that there is a somewhat, a thing-in-itself, back of all the phenomena. This ground of all being is just what we know in our self-consciousness, namely, will. The nature of this will is irrational, impulsive, striving for objectification, or life. Individual immortality is a foolish dream. The soul is an invention of man's fertile brain. Freedom of the will, in the ordinary sense, is a fiction. There is only a freedom of being. We share with all will in ceaseless striving and endless dissatisfaction. Thus life is essentially evil, "swinging like a pendulum, backward and forward, between pain and ennui." At the end, after all our deep interest and solicitude, death, having played with us for a little while as his prey, swallows us up.

In view of these truths—concludes pessimism—man may follow one of two courses, either of assertion or of denial of the will. In assertion of the will, he affirms in the light of reason, the choice previously made by blind will. In denial of the will, the will, guided by the intellect, sees the evil nature of life and the folly of its assertion, contradicts its own phenomenon, and wills not to be. The way of salvation is not, however, as might be supposed, by suicide, but by voluntary asceticism or the suffering inflicted by fate.

We thus reach that practical side of Schopenhauer's philosophy, on which we find him claiming for his teaching the support of the Christian religion. "Christianity," he says, "is the doctrine of the deep guilt of the human race through its existence alone, and the deliverance from it through an entire reversal of human nature." "The power . . . of Christianity lies solely in its pessimism,—in the confession that our state is exceedingly wretched and sinful." It is not hard, of course, to detect radical

errors in these and like statements. The words "world" and "flesh," and the teachings of Christ concerning "self-denial," "forsaking all," and "bearing the cross," are quoted with audacious literalism, and then made to assume, from their position in Schopenhauer's writings, a meaning quite peculiar to his philosophy. But neither the material world, nor the physical body, nor the earthly life, is ever spoken of in the Scriptures as essentially evil. It is the *over-assertion* of the will, — the selfishness which Schopenhauer so vividly describes, that is evil. For selfishness is the essence of all sin. Christianity is, indeed, "a revelation of the deep guilt of the human race," but *not* "through its existence alone." There *is* a Christian "deliverance through an entire reversal," yet this is *not* a contradiction of self, but a true self-development through subordination to God. Thus the Christian religion is not, as the pessimistic philosophy would have us believe, virtuous and irrational, but virtuous and rational and hopeful; while selfishness is wholly irrational, and its necessary correlate a life of pessimistic despair.

Having by these distinctions saved ourselves from the philosopher's confusion of himself with Christ, — other thoughts, just now more neglected, but stronger and, if possible, more true, come to us as we read Schopenhauer, — thoughts arising from the *agreement* which exists between Schopenhauer's philosophy and the Christian teaching.

This agreement is real. It is not in the metaphysics. Schopenhauer's metaphysics is untrue to man's inner consciousness, and hopelessly inconsistent. It certainly is not in the basis of ethics. The two systems can scarcely be placed too wide apart. It is not, once more, in the verdict they pass upon life. The New Testament is anything but pessimistic in the real sense. It *is* in the genuine and deep appreciation, common to both, of the reality and enormity of evil; of the value of suffering in sanctification; and, most of all, of the hopeless delusion of selfish indulgence. All life which is dominated by desire, of whatsoever sort, all life which has its supreme object in *getting*, of necessity "swings like a pendulum, backward and forward, between pain and ennui." This is the great truth of Schopenhauer. Positively, he leaves us little. But negatively he flings out to our thoughtless and often shallow optimism this significant warning. And the warning finds its counterpart to the full in the teachings of Jesus and of Paul.

Extremes meet. Most men to-day are not genuinely hopeful.

Unphilosophical, they yet have a philosophy ; and Schopenhauer, though they do not know him, is their interpreter. They are unwilling to substitute a future of which they know little for a present of which they know much. And in this they are right. But the meaning which the future might lend to the present, and the meaning the present contains for high-minded men — future or no future — is despised. The spiritual is despised of. Its demands are too great, and its promises to pay doubted. There is little conviction of guilt ; but slight sense of responsibility ; almost no thought of being "made perfect through suffering." Physical evil is everywhere and real. To escape from it in every possible way, — this is the ambition borne in upon men daily. The result is pessimism, enervating and deadly.

Then comes the reaction. In the confusion, the jangling demands of the sense-life only are heard. Sensual gratification leads every other. Drinking and drunkenness follow closely in its train. To be amused is the fashion of the day. The passion for wealth seems to swallow all higher aspirations. For this, and such as this, men gladly live and toil ! This, in one form and another, is confidently relied on, as containing the happiness sought, and forever expected — to-morrow. The result is an unthinking and fraudulent optimism. Optimism in the phenomena of life, based on pessimism regarding the realities !

To such a condition of thought and of action the pulpit of to-day is not bringing what it ought. A pessimism which, though erroneous in itself, is yet founded on awful truths, is not to be met by a religious optimism as shallow and almost as thoughtless as that of the world which it hopes to convert. Misinterpretation is not to be corrected by no interpretation at all. Schopenhauer's sneer at the Protestant ministry and their "degenerate doctrine of a loving father, who has made a very pleasant and beautiful world for his children to enjoy, and promises them a still more beautiful one if they will conform to his will in certain respects," — is unjust to the facts, but yet far from groundless. The truth of the love and fatherhood of God we will hold to through all the mystery of evil. It is the light of the world. But a disregard for the awful reality of evil, a shrinking from the discipline of suffering, and a failure to emphasize the ruinous absurdity of indolent self-indulgence, — are no real part of this doctrine, and tend far away from a true understanding of the nature and value of life.

Our ultra-orthodox theology, in relegating heaven very largely to the future, and then making the condition of eternal blessedness

there the acceptance of certain specified articles of intellectual belief here, has assigned, with unblushing arrogance, all but a fraction of our poor human race to eternal damnation, and cast a gloom of despair over religion, more pessimistic than all the pessimism that Germany and Italy and the East can ever hope to produce.

Our so-called new theology, on the other hand, has sometimes made the future seem vague and unreal. Not infrequently it has substituted elegant disquisitions on unfortunate environments of evil and desirable educational virtue, for the preaching of sin and righteousness and judgment, which the appalling condition of men guilty before God and miserably sinful demands.

Neither always points very clearly to the absolute necessity of a deep and immediate revolution in life, of holy self-denial and subordination to God, or to the hope which lies in this truly essential Christ, and in no other name given under heaven.

It is very easy, I know, and very fruitless, for those of us who stand near the beginning of life's real activity to seize at new philosophies of life, or novel schemes for winning men to God. I offer none. Only it comes to me more and more, that if this guilty, suffering, sorrowing world is, in our day, to know more of Christ, it will be because of a practical recognition, on our part, of this old, old truth the Master taught: "If any man would come after me, let him *deny himself*, and take up his *cross* and follow me." And when men say, as they have said, that the clergyman of the future will find himself unable to reconcile with modern civilization — with the German worship of nature, and the British worship of wealth, and the French worship of pleasure, and the American worship of progress — the doctrine of self-renunciation; it is time that the pulpit should make clear what that doctrine of self-renunciation is, and then, in practice and in preaching, urge it, with the authority of the Lord Christ himself, against all of these degrading, pessimism-breeding forms of modern idolatry.

At all costs, let us be honest. If denial of ourselves means nothing more than conforming to the requirements of polite society, let us acknowledge this and exchange our New Testaments for books on social etiquette. If the command, "If thy right hand causeth thee to stumble, cut it off and cast it from thee," contains nothing binding upon us, let us renounce our allegiance to the Christ who gave it, and openly cease to follow Him. If, once more, the words, "Whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple," have become so extremely

"Oriental" as to have no application to our Western, worldly life, — then there *are* no conditions of Christian discipleship ; and we might better preach and labor and pray, if at all, under some other name.

Let no one misunderstand me. I plead for no foolishly literal interpretation, but against that explanation which explains altogether away. I write in behalf of no cruel or ascetic requirements, but rather for that true self-development which "counts all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord." We may not need the *dies stationum* — the sentry days — of the Christians of the early church; but we do need more retirement from the world, more thinking alone with God. We shall gain nothing from a selfish seclusion, like that of many of the anchorites of old ; but we shall gain infinitely much if we learn what it means to be "in the world but not of it."

Ascetic monasticism, however laudable its aim, condemned itself in the fanatical pride, anger, uncleanness, and despair of its devotees. But the revulsion has been rude and extreme. And we need, our country needs, helpless, sinning, suffering men need, those to whom plain living and high thinking have become worthy means to noble ends, — who "scorn delights and love labors in the high endeavor to make earth like heaven, and every man like God."

Thus let the spirit of the *suffering* Saviour be our spirit, and men shall know that the power of Christianity lies, as the philosopher has said, in its "confession that our state is exceedingly wretched and sinful," not, as he would have it, because it ends in this confession, in pessimism ; but because, with this, man's spiritual nature shall experience God's redemption of the world unto himself, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Gerald Hamilton Beard.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

MISSIONS WITHIN AND WITHOUT CHRISTENDOM.

IN this age of rapidly advancing missionary enterprise, it is of vital importance to consider for what classes of missions alone we can claim the interest of all Christians, and can found our claim upon the New Testament. I say, it is of vital importance to consider, not to inquire, for inquiry is surely superfluous.

The only object of missionary activity known in the New Testament is, the communication of the message, that "God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son," and the only men addressed by this message are those who do not know it, or at least who have not accepted it. Everything beyond that is not properly an object of apostolic, but of pastoral activity.

Of course, concrete reality will never accommodate itself very closely to abstract logical lines. The apostolic function includes not only the founding of churches, but the development of faith among them on all its theoretical and practical sides, and the guarding of it against essential deprivations. Indeed, the whole later life of St. John was pastoral, rather than missionary, in its immediate form. Nevertheless, in the first age, all pastoral work was but an aspect of missionary work, for the churches were continually extending the Christian message into the midst of a pagan population. One limitation there assuredly was. Mutual intrusion of Christian teachers into one another's fields of labor, with the presentation of bewildering varieties of view, was not acknowledged as a legitimate form of apostolic activity. We know how much Paul suffered from such intrusions, and how bitterly he resented them. And though he nowhere accuses the Twelve of such encroachments, his language leads us sometimes to believe that he thought they might have supported him more vigorously than they did against them. On the other hand, keen as was his sense of the dangers to evangelical faith and life involved in the Judaizing tendencies, it never entered his mind to plan missionary excursions into such churches, on the plea of "bringing the gospel to them." If the name of Christ were acknowledged, and his law taken as the guide of life, he was content, and the more entirely content the farther he advanced in life. "I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice."

How entirely different is the present principle of proceeding in a great part of Christendom! The Roman Catholics, more than half the Christian name, declare that no Christian communities which are not obedient to Rome have any legitimate right to exist, or that if a part of them, the Oriental churches, by the possession of valid orders and spiritual jurisdiction, have a right to exist, they have no right to continue in their present independence. They are objectively, and it is to be presumed in large part subjectively, in rebellion against the supreme authority of Christ, as embodied in his Vicar. Therefore, although they are by no means regarded as *infideles*, and although the expression *partes infidelium* has been

exchanged for another on the express ground of its liability to be misunderstood as applying to heretical or schismatical countries, yet they are regarded, no less than Jews, Moslems, or Pagans, as being in the strictest sense objects of missionary activity. The great Catholic hierarchy of our own country is, perhaps not quite as immediately, yet quite as fully, subject to the Congregatio De Propaganda Fide, as the humblest missionary priest in Borneo or New Guinea.

The Greek Church, it is true, makes no such exorbitant pretensions, and, on the other hand, develops no such various missionary activity.

The Roman See may thus be compared with the Church of Jerusalem, so far as this had fallen under the Pharisaizing influence, and availed itself of its supreme metropolitan dignity to harass and oppress the free evangelical life of the churches of Paul's foundation, maintaining that his converts were only a kind of half believers, who could find no assured entrance into the Messianic salvation except by abjuring their heretical and rebellious founder, and submitting themselves to the only legitimate central authority.

How far do the Protestants, in return, act on Paul's principle, repelling such arrogant claims, and vindicating their immediate relation to Christ, manifested in the fruits of the Spirit, but abstaining from all corresponding intrusions on the territory of the elder churches? The different sections of Protestantism differ widely as to this. The Lutherans, more than half the Protestant world, may be supposed to accept Luther's affirmation, made after a generation of conflict, that the Roman Catholic Church is a true church, and may, by *synecdoche*, be rightly called a holy church. I am not aware that, after the final clarification of results, they have ever dreamed of undertaking missions in Roman Catholic or Greek territory. They would as soon, I suppose, think of repeating Roman Catholic or Greek baptism. Where Lutheran congregations are found in the territory of the elder churches, it is only such as are made up of emigrants, and if a few, or a good many, Roman Catholics or Greeks should attach themselves to them, it would merely be because they had used their liberty, not because the Lutheran churches have been in any way laid out as centres of propagandism.

The Calvinistic churches on the Continent, although more intensely hostile to Catholicism, yet, after the three great confessions had come into a relative equilibrium, accepted, were it only from

the force of circumstances, substantially the same policy. Any recent changes of this will be considered farther on.

The Church of England, in reforming herself, expressly and officially declared that she had no intention of separating herself from the communion of the churches of Southern Europe. If they separated themselves from her, that was their responsibility. The act declaring that "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction within this realm" was not a declaration that he was Antichrist, or a denial of his principal rank in Christendom, but simply a withdrawal of that appellate authority over English Christians with which these had, now in greater measure, now in less, seen fit to invest him in the past. Even Mary Tudor made little difficulty over this, regarding it merely as a point of order, not of doctrine. The subsequent return to the Roman obedience was, with her, as with Gardiner, rather that they found this indispensable than that they believed it obligatory. The Articles, it is true, denounce various opinions and usages still maintained in the south as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." But as the English people did not imagine themselves to have been pagans when these superstitions prevailed among them, so they did not suppose the churches of Southern Europe to have thereby lost the rights of Christian communion, nor have they ever prescribed to Roman Catholics any form of abjuration as a condition of being admitted to the Eucharist. The Articles, moreover (which have no application to the laity), have always been rather a sop to the Cerberus of polemical Protestantism than a substantial part of Anglicanism. Polemical Protestantism, it is true, has often, and for long stretches of time, prevailed in the Church of England, and I cannot positively say that even the two Convocations may not sometimes have collectively described the Pope as Antichrist and the Roman Catholics as idolaters, though I am not aware that they have. It is certain, however, that no such positions have ever been obligatory on the conscience of a priest or a layman of the Church of England. She has sometimes signified her readiness, as in the correspondence between Archbishop Wake and the Gallicans, to render sisterly help to any Catholic churches which might wish to secure national independence of Rome, or to reform their doctrine or use; but she has never dreamed of organizing missions among them, as if they were aliens from Christ.

In Scotland, where the Catholic Church had become peculiarly worthless and corrupt, the reaction was thoroughgoing. Presbyterianism here not only denounced the Pope as Antichrist, and

his subjects as idolaters, but treated as an intolerable heresy the assumption that a Roman Catholic could ever be in a state of salvation. Edinburgh ministers declared themselves ready to pray for the conversion of the Queen precisely as if she had been a worshiper of Jupiter or Odin. Few, I think, accused her of being a worshiper of the chaste Diana. It is true, the continued recognition of Roman Catholic baptism, if not of Roman Catholic ordination, was a silent witness against these violent assumptions. But its implications were disregarded, and the Church of Scotland took a position which would have been perfectly consistent with organizing precisely such missions in Southern Europe as in Turkey or Hindostan, had either effort then been possible. Modern Scottish Presbyterianism, therefore, although it has receded from the extremes of its earlier attitude, might easily regard Italy and Spain as being at least admissible missionary ground in the more rigorous sense.

Of course, so far and so fast as the English Puritans detached themselves from Anglicanism, they, in their advancing grades of intensity, as Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists, took up the Scottish position, and denied to the Roman Catholics all right to the Christian name. Whether the Independents rebaptized Catholics, if any joined them, I do not know. American Congregationalists, we are aware, do not incline to this. But their traditional position, notwithstanding the great mitigation of its earlier assumptions, renders it not very hard for them to treat Roman Catholic and Oriental Christendom essentially as if it were in one category with Islam or Paganism.

It is true, Archbishop Leighton, a Calvinist of the Church of Scotland, to which his relations were not essentially changed by the accident of his episcopal consecration, held that a true Christian life could be led under the most defective form of Christianity known in Great Britain. Richard Baxter, no less, steadily exposed himself to the hostility and misinterpretation of his brethren, to vindicate to Roman Catholics the name of fellow-Christians, partakers with us, as he declares, of one faith, one baptism, and one covenant of salvation. But these two lofty-minded men only characterize their associates by contrast.

Methodism has, from the beginning, been noted for its violent antipathy, not to say ferocity, to its great rival, Catholicism, whose competition it justly regards as a very serious obstacle to the realization of designs often avowed by its ministers of "bringing the whole world to the foot of the Cross," in other words, of swallow-

ing up, or reducing to entire subordination, all other activities of Christianity, designs which it seems somewhat difficult to distinguish from those avowed by Rome, all thoughts of coercion apart. Methodism, accordingly, does not by any means confine its missionary operations, within Christendom, to the Roman Catholic world, but subjects equally and indifferently to the authority of its Propaganda every Protestant region, from the most rationalistic districts of Prussia to the most warmly evangelical districts of Wurtemberg.

This extension of the character of missionary ground from the Catholic to the Protestant parts of Continental Europe seems hitherto peculiar to Americans. However American Methodists may be regarded as preëminent in a joyous unscrupulousness of contempt for any objections that may be advanced by their fellow-Protestants of the continent on the ground of brotherly comity and ecclesiastical right, they are not alone in it. The Baptists, also (though apparently, in the north, rather as aiding native movements than as endeavoring to force their way in) represent, in their missionary reports, Italy, Spain, Germany, and Sweden, alongside of Burma and Teluguland, as the objects of one and the same missionary activity. And at last the Congregationalists, in the keen delight with which they are extending their hands to the Waldenströmian movement in Sweden, seem to have entered themselves as contestants in this eager race of ecclesiastical ambition.

Now the perfect right of everybody to propagate any opinions in which he is interested, from the worship of a sunflower to the canonical shape of a cassock, is incontestable. Yet a society formed to bring the gospel of God to nations that have not known it, or have not yet accepted it, may well be excused for not caring also to send out delegates to promote the cultivation of sunflowers, or to exalt the popular estimation of chasubles, important as both these interesting objects undoubtedly are in themselves. And though questions of church government, and, far more, profound questions of Christian thought, immensely outrank all the intricacies of pontifical wardrobes, or the endlessness of baptismal disputes, yet high above all, in another heaven of essential and eternal worth, rises this: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

How, then, can we possibly allow that it is legitimate to combine with this great object objects to be carried out in parts of the

world where Christianity is admitted and inculcated, and where all spiritual and moral aspirations rest upon it as upon the established standard? Is it the promotion of the Protestant doctrine of Justification by Faith? Excellent, and most important. If an association can bring this again to its due honor, it thoroughly deserves that one should be formed, which might well begin with some of our principal Protestant divines, and end up with the Pope. Is it to oppose the excessive honors rendered by the Romanists to Mary? Good, though, as was remarked to me once by Professor Karr, hardly so immediately important as to work against the excessive honors rendered by the Protestants to Mammon. Is it to protest against the dangerous efficacy allowed to a mere attrition in securing forgiveness of sin? This is very desirable, and so is it also to protest against the dangerous efficacy for the same end attributed to subjective states or emotional experiences. The whole life of each Christian, of each church, and of universal Christendom, is to be one long endeavor to rise out of crude beginnings, and dangerous misapprehensions, into the pure simplicity of the light of Christ. But surely the effort to render Christendom ever more worthy of its name is essentially distinct (however fundamentally congruous) from the effort to bring outlying territory into the avowed allegiance of Christ. A society which undertakes this end confuses all apprehensions by coöordinating ends to be wrought for on this assured foundation, with the laying of the foundation itself. Send out three men under the same authority, to China, to Spain, and to Sweden, and either you discredit the vital importance of evangelizing the heathen world, or you raise into a pernicious equality with it the endeavor to proselytize your fellow-Christians, or even your fellow-Protestants, or even Protestants whom you recognize as thoroughly sound in doctrine, and godly in life, to your own particular sect. Evangelization is fundamental. Proselytism may be legitimate, but to put it in one category, to rate it as belonging in the most distant sense together with evangelization, is, I will not say what I do not believe, a sin against the Holy Ghost, but it is a direful though unconscious blasphemy against the Son of man, as if any of our halting interpretations of Him were to be compared with the being brought to the loyal recognition of Him as the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, the Head of the eternal Kingdom of holy brotherhood.

Still, we must not forget, in comparing the present Christendom with the Apostolic Church, that there is one sad development for which this afforded as yet hardly either space or time, namely, the

virtual apostasy of great regions from everything but the mere name and form of Christianity, and the failure of other great regions ever to rise into its reality. Are whole countries, like southern Italy, Mexico, Brazil, to be forever exempted from all attempts to teach them a gospel of living faith and righteousness, merely because the old heathenism, hardly disturbed, nay, in some respects even aggravated, is covered by a veil of Christian profession and ecclesiastical observance? No. We are to look for the reality of things, and to act according to it. Mr. Howells will not be accused of dangerous zeal for Protestantism against Catholicism, for although personally he dislikes the latter, and is keenly sensible of the immense alloy of mere magic in it, yet somewhere, in terms almost identical with those of Chalmers, he describes it with expressions of respect and hope, as the greatest organization for doing good in the world. Yet this does not prevent him from expressing the satisfaction he felt in attending an examination of Protestant school children in Italy, to see that these little Italians were now taught a religion not to be separated from ethics. Lasaulx also, the brother of Sister Augustine, intense Catholic as he was, assured his sister once of his belief that the ripest fruits of Christianity can never be gathered in a Protestant country without a large activity of Catholicism, and in a Catholic country without a large activity of Protestantism. Our Catholic brethren are certainly not unmindful of their half of this responsibility, and it becomes us to be not unmindful of our half. Associations for the spread of Protestantism in the Latin countries are therefore a privilege and a duty. But we have no right to fuse them with associations for preaching Christ to those who do not acknowledge Him, unless we are willing to take the responsibility of declaring of a certain Latin or Slavonic country that it is actually heathen.

Can we take this responsibility as to *any* country? The Mohammedans have not shrunk from a similar one. The Sunnite authorities have pronounced a formal decision, that the Shiite Persians are to be accounted as not Moslems at all, but as simple Giaours, infidels. Such a decision, cutting off an important fraction of the Mohammedan world from all recognition whatever, on account of subordinate variations of belief, affects us with disgust, and appears to us supremely silly besides, because it dangerously divides the forces of Islam. *De nobis fabula.* As to a decision that a Moslem region was so negligent of the precepts of the Apostle of God that it was to be held as Giaour, I do not suppose such a thing was ever thought of. Supreme folly, like

supreme excellence, is reserved for exhibition within the Christian pale. If a Mohammedan region were found very negligent of the spirit of its religion, the true believers might well send a deputation into it, to bring it up to the right level, but they would not crown this with the honors of a mission to the unbelievers. And as to nominally Christian countries, we should be deterred from setting ourselves up as a tribunal which Christ has never authorized. If we will do it, we are almost sure to find that the most disparaging judgments expressed by high authority are afterwards essentially mitigated by high authority. Thus, a French priest (I forget his name) says that the people of Mexico are Catholics, but are not Christians. On the other hand, a missionary of the American Board, who certainly had a stronger temptation to confirm such a judgment than the first author to form it, says, that while Rome has been in Mexico woefully remiss in her duty, she has not suffered the gospel message to remain altogether void of fruit. Robert Southey, again, says that before the rise of the Wesleys the common people of England had been Catholics and were Protestants, but had never been Christians. But we can imagine Southey's feelings, or Wesley's, if an association of German Christians had been formed, "to introduce the gospel into Hindostan, China, and England"!

I have understood (for I did not follow the proceedings at the time) that the American Board was very reluctant to take up work in Roman Catholic Europe. It is no wonder. We are conscious, in coming from the consideration of pagan and Mohammedan lands to papal lands, that we have to throw our minds into another attitude, and to summon up a range of motives, partly the same, indeed, but largely different, and of an essentially inferior cogency. It is really an incongruous work, which ought never to have been taken on, and the sooner it is remanded to an avowedly proselytizing society, the sooner the primary motives which appeal to Christians, as such, will have their unembarrassed force. To Protestantize is a good work. Could one tenth, nay, one twentieth, of the Spaniards or Italians be Protestantized, even in a loose and vague sense, we cannot doubt that it would give a vast upward impulse to those countries, spiritually, ethically, socially, intellectually, and politically. Nevertheless, to Protestantize is one thing, and to Christianize is another. To put the two undertakings into the same category is to dishonor Christ, in the same way in which it is done by the High Lutheran motto : *Gottes Wort und Luther's Lehr' Vergehet nun und nimmermehr*, "The

Word of God and Luther's lore, shall perish now nor nevermore." Every way, shape, and manner of coördinating even an apostle, much more a reformer, with our Redeemer is a blasphemy against the gospel.

The next thing in order will be to require the American Board to add to its rubric of "Papal Lands" another rubric, of "Lutheran Lands." Why not? Put together all that has been written against the Church of Sweden by the champions of the Waldenströmians (who, no doubt, are very worthy people), and all that is said by the same persons against the German and Scandinavian Lutherans of the West, and it is easy to gather the impression that to Congregationalize Sweden is but little less important than to Christianize China, or at least a Chinese population of the same amount. The method of their propagandism evinces at times either a lack of intelligence or of ingenuousness unworthy of Christian men. Thus, one conspicuous writer of this school speaks with contemptuous bitterness of "Lutheran priests." Does he not know that in Danish and Swedish the word for "minister" is "priest"? He uses this invidious term — which he would have to use of himself if he addressed Scandinavians — to stir up in his readers' minds vague associations with the sacerdotal claims of the old Church, and he wholly ignores the fact that the Lutheran doctrine of the priesthood is evangelical to the core. Swedish ministers, indeed, like English, are more domineering than American, but not from any false doctrine concerning priesthood. So the same writer endeavors to stir up a factitious zeal for his sectarian propagandism by expressions of pious horror against the looseness of discipline that will admit saints and Sabbath-breakers to sit down together at the communion, the Sabbath-breakers, of course, being those Christians who follow the doctrine of the Lord's Day which Luther and Calvin taught, and which the most saintly Protestants of the Continent have followed from their day to this. Surely we, who have sat down at many a Puritan communion-table, alongside of the purest saints, with usurers, with oppressors of the poor and defrauders of the widow and the orphan, and who know very well that there is not vigor of discipline enough in the bulk of our churches, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, or Methodist, to cast out the worship of Mammon in its thousand ramifications (if even so coarse an instrument were apt for such an end), may well excuse ourselves from hypocritically affecting an obligation to enter on a crusade against our fellow-Protestants who think that Martin Luther's exposition of

the Decalogue is as good as ours. As for this, the writer knows of a church, made up of German Lutherans, and occupying quite a metropolitan position, which, in doctrine, rite, manner of living, observance of the Sunday, relation to amusements, he has thoroughly authentic testimony, differs in nothing essential from other Lutheran congregations, and yet, because it has chosen to call itself Congregational, and goes to swell the Year Book, is looked upon as quite a triumph of evangelical grace. Fie upon such endeavors to cover the selfishness of sectarian schemings with the mantle of zeal for the kingdom of God!

We have known, on the other hand, a revival to break out almost spontaneously among a community of Swedes, who shaped themselves with the least possible interference from without, into an extensive Methodist congregation, which has been for years a fount of blessing, spiritual, moral, and social, for miles around. Wherever the life of God is deepened among a people, then, whether the most appropriate vehicle to contain it turns out to be Lutheranism, Methodism, Congregationalism, or anything else, this is to be hailed as a subordinate factor of the good work. But if anybody can believe that this is the motive most distinctly imprinted on a large part of these proselytizing enterprises in Christendom, above all in Protestant Christendom, we wish him joy of his faith.

There is, however, another terrible fact, prompting to efforts which do not in the least come under these animadversions. In every country, above all in every Continental country, and most of all in Germany, Switzerland, France, Italy, and Spain, there are vast numbers of men who have fallen away into avowed unbelief. They are within the limits of Christendom, but they no more belong to it. They are therefore just as much the objects of a true missionary activity as if they lived in Japan, with the advantage that they are of our own European race, and are still surcharged with Christian remembrances. It by no means follows, indeed, that such a work ought to be done by our Foreign Missionary Societies. It is as profoundly different from theirs as efforts to recover the lapsed must always be from efforts to bring in the aliens. But it need not be tainted with the stamp of proselytism, which dishonors its deep and awful solemnity. And as one great reason of this lapse is apt to be that the hereditary religion of the country has become too stiff to adapt itself to new developments of character and thought, there is often as distinct a call to foreign Christians, "Come over and help us," as if it were raised by the man of Macedonia in the apostolic vision.

The most perfect type of such a work is the McAll Mission. Doubtless there is abundance of deep and pure Christian life in the Catholic Church of France, its laity, its priesthood, and its episcopate. There are, we hear, promising revivals of religion going on in France, especially under the direction of the Dominicans, those adherents (so far as Rome will allow) of the nobler Augustinian theology of old. Cardinal Richard, the present Archbishop of Paris, appears fully worthy to stand by the side of those other *forestieri* in the Sacred College, a Lavigerie, a Manning, a Newman, a Taschereau, a Gibbons, whose appointment reflects so much honor on the contemporary papacy. Besides his deep interest and active supervision, accorded to reviving faith in atheistic Paris, he energetically summons his brethren to appropriate fearlessly the best fruits of Protestant Christianity, especially the Sunday-school. He draws a speaking picture of this great institute as it is found in the Protestant Anglo-Saxon world, of the innumerable multitudes gathered, after or before the public worship of God, from the hoary-headed judge to the humblest waif of the streets, to study the Word of God together, and calls on his own people to imitate them. Other clergymen, under episcopal authorization, are helping such a work by putting out vernacular editions of the Scriptures, calling on their fellow-Catholics to reject "the disastrous novelty" which discourages the universal use of the Bible. No: the Church of St. Louis, of Gerson, of the Mère Angélique, of Fénelon, of Lacordaire, is not dead, and we may well hope that, as Dr. R. D. Hitchcock angus of the Roman Catholic Church at large, its noblest days are yet to come. Nevertheless, the fetters which its subjection to Rome still compels it to lay on thought, the multiplicity of doctrines which it imposes, couched in the hard terms of Roman law and scholastic philosophy, the mediatorial position which it ascribes to its priesthood, not by virtue of their personal union with Christ, but by virtue of a half-magical consecration, the burdensome redundancy of the mere "instrumentalities of religion," — to quote from the "Catholic Review," — the encouragement given to a lawless sentimentality and credulity in shaping Catholic faith, the childish veneration bestowed on trumpery images, accredited by whimsical legend, not to say sometimes by imposture, and, above all, the strange mixture of a presumptuous confidence in sacraments with an unfilial distrust of God's justifying grace, have alienated multitudes of virile minds, not least among the working-classes, that have no patience to wait until, perchance, the inward fire

of faith and love may some time or other burn its way through these huge encumbrances, and warm them into life. Multitudes have become thoroughly tired of the Catholic Church, who have not become at all tired of the gospel of Christ. Therefore, when a quiet Scotchman and his quiet wife, in rude French, in a rude hall, made known the pure gospel, "the unorganized Christianity of the New Testament," — in Quinet's words, — it ran like wild-fire, and from that little centre the work is branching out into every part of France. There is no interference with Christian Catholicism, but really help, unless Catholics insist that no one shall bring to God those whom they cannot. The more such missions spring up on the Continent, the greater blessing there will be. If any considerable fraction of the present masses of unbelief can be redeemed to Protestantism, it will only be through being redeemed to Christ. Such a work is as distinct from proselytizing on the one hand as it is from missions to the unevangelized on the other. It certainly, and most happily, greatly helps Protestantism, but it helps Catholicism, if less extensively, no less truly, for it helps all the children and all the churches of God. It discourages superstition, heavy dogmatism, virtual heathenism, childish ostentation of rite, it is true. But Roman Catholicism can endure to be vastly lightened of all this pernicious rubbish, and be so much the better for it.

This leads us to speak of the rapid increase of aggressiveness on the part of the French Protestants themselves, which was witnessed a few years ago. I do not know how far this has been maintained, but it certainly has been so in a measure. This is almost a vital necessity for Protestants in France, especially since they have been so extensively weakened by the retrocession of Alsace-Lorraine. Against the tremendous pressure of superincumbent Catholicism they can hardly live, except by manfully vindicating their right to live. This work is essentially the same as that of Paul and his disciples against the Judaizers. Vindication here, indeed, can take no other form than that of positive aggression. And yet even this directly impinges much less upon Catholicism than upon the same mass of unbelief upon which the McAll Mission acts, or, rather, the mass of chaotic readiness to believe, waiting for a satisfying and unembarrassed message of salvation, and for a definite mould into which its indeterminate spirituality may be cast. Essentially the same thing is true of the activity of the venerable Waldensian Church in Italy. And of all forms of assistance rendered to these evangelical move-

ments in Latin Christendom, the intimate relation between the Waldenses and the Church of Scotland is one of the purest and most unreservedly to be commended. This assistance rendered by a foreign to a native church, to secure its existence and to aid in its legitimate, healthy extension, includes every element of good, and is free of every element of evil, to be found in these missions within Christendom.

Closely related with this is aid like that rendered by Episcopilians, notably by Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin, to efforts for constituting churches in the Latin countries on the historical foundations of Catholicism, but free from papal despotism, Tridentine dogmatism, the moral dangers involved in compulsory celibacy and a compulsory confessional, and that darkening and deadening exuberance of outward observance of which the Roman Breviary complained bitterly three hundred years ago, but after a generation ceased to complain, because apparently the papacy, having tried so long a struggle with it, found its energies inadequate to cope with the flood of sacerdotal and popular externalism. The legitimacy of such efforts of reform, even from the Roman Catholic point of view, cannot well be denied, for the most exaggerated Ultramontanism is still so far governed by the essential Christian consciousness, that it cannot but often restrict papal authority to that which is essentially reasonable, and conducive to the ends of the gospel. The doctrine laid down by St. Alphonso Liguori, and confirmed by general theological consent, that a notoriously unjust sentence of the church deserves no attention, or, as Bellarmine puts it, that Peter has no power to bind that which ought not to be bound, seems to require no great pressing to expand into still broader conclusions. The mere brute power of the Curia has hitherto crushed all free initiative of reform, to the great grief, as is well understood, of Leo XIII., but the papers of Dr. Langdon and of Dr. Nevin in this "Review" and elsewhere, the works of Father Curci, and other means of information, show how far the Catholic conscience of Italy, and of other countries, daunted as it is by the imperious usurpers of pontifical thunders, is from being quieted, and how much authority it finds in great saints and doctors, even of the later times, for going on in directions which are now denounced as schismatical and heretical, but which they hope Rome may yet be constrained to absolve of censure, as she absolved Savonarola's memory seventy-one years after his death. We cannot say to what these faint beginnings will amount; but we can say that

they are well worthy of a helping hand, even on specifically Catholic, I might almost say, on specifically Roman Catholic principles, and that those pedantic High Churchmen who complain of Archbishop Plunket and his associates, betray sympathies which are likely in the end to find a more congenial home than the Protestant Church of England. It is to be hoped that her genuine bishops, priests, and laymen will not be deterred by antiquated canons, passed in a different world, and even as such not bearing out the objectors, from stretching forth their brotherly hands to enable Spanish or Italian Catholics to lead an ecclesiastical life on historical lines, without the necessity of forfeiting evangelical freedom or civic franchises. Under such anachronistic scruples there lies hid a sullen sacerdotal hatred of Christian liberty, which is far worse in its effects, and little better in itself, than the most rancorous anti-popish malevolence.

The missions of the American Board, and of the Presbyterian Board, in Turkey, as well as Persia, are a very admirable transition from intra-Christian to extra-Christian work. Operating within churches whose inferior numbers have withheld them from cherishing the almost inaccessible pride of Roman Catholics or Greeks, they have been enabled to help in a far more eminent measure than any have yet been enabled to help in the larger churches, while, at the same time, as they are in the full sense *in partibus infidelium*, they are ever ready to open out into the immediate unmixed work of evangelization. The "Guardian" may, indeed, in its arrogant English High Church pride, affect to "pity" those Greeks who have joined Presbyterian churches in Syria,—of heretical Armenians, no doubt, it takes less account,—but these doubtless know where their Christian life finds its best nourishment. It does seem, however, as if there were some men that would rather see Oriental Christians canonically damned, than un canonically brought to a living faith. Of such men Bishop Blyth seems to be not an absolutely incongruous representative. It is much to the honor of the archbishop and four bishops who have acted as arbitrators in the vexatious controversy which he has forced on the Church Missionary Society, that though most of these prelates are by no means of the school chiefly represented in the society, they, in simple equity, and loyalty to the position of the Church of England, decide for the society, and against the bishop. The Church Missionary Society takes a very sound position. Its missionaries in Palestine and Syria are expected to use every opportunity to evangelize the Mohammedans,

and they are neither expected nor permitted to try for the conversion of Greeks into Anglicans. But their preaching and services are to be open to all comers, and if Greeks wish to become communicants with them, they are at liberty to receive them, without affecting to be living in the fourth century, and holding solicitous consultations with Oriental bishops who dislike their doctrine and doubt their orders, and whose dispositions towards them are, for the most part, such as to make an anxious parade of comity on the part of the Englishmen rather ridiculous. I do not mean that the Evangelicals have not a somewhat narrow disposition to exaggerate unfavorable signs in the Oriental Church. But where spiritual stagnation is so gross, open, and palpable, to insist that every formula and ceremony of spiritual parity shall be anxiously stood upon, seems to be by far the greater fault of the two. But sacerdotalism always prized the shell above the meat, and always will.

The reader will not have failed to note that the various positions assumed in this paper by no means fit together with the precision of mosaics. I have endeavored to follow reality, and the surgings of reality are not always rhythmically harmonious to our mortal ears. I believe the general principles laid down to be sound, and fundamentally important, as they certainly represent the general consent of Protestant scholarship in our day. Abstract principles are not the less imperative because they are abstract, but the more so. Yet, as theoretical mechanics must accommodate itself to the reality of friction, so must theoretical Christianity. Christendom is too vast, its history is too ancient and complicated, the great chasm of divergence opened in it by the Reformation is too wide, the angles of vision are too many, to allow of a categorical summons to every church and society to wheel suddenly about, and throw all its operations, views, habits of thought and speech at once out of their old gearing. Nevertheless, as the animosities of the great conflict of the sixteenth century gradually die down, its uncharitable exaggerations must be corrected, and it must be acknowledged more and more emphatically, in word and in policy, that no chasm between the followers of Christ can ever, without grievous sin, be treated as if it were the impassable chasm between Abraham and Dives, that there is a fundamental distinction, which must ultimately express itself in the whole form of outward activity, between Missions Within Christendom and Missions Without, between Proselytism and Conversion.

Charles C. Starbuck.

ANDOVER.

EUDÆMONISTIC ETHICS.—A REPLY.

THE December number of this "Review" contained an article by the Rev. William Forbes Cooley, criticising a paper of mine which appeared in the September number. Doubtless unintentionally, my courteous critic has somewhat misrepresented my position. Thus, after quoting my language regarding the aim of life, he ignores what immediately follows, where the perfection to be aimed at is described as "the realization of the possibilities felt within and pressing for fulfillment . . . As implying the realization of all the possibilities of humanity, it is broad enough to have a legitimate place for science and art, and all those large and impersonal interests, without which life is necessarily narrow, and therefore dull and joyless." Is it quite just to intimate that, in my treatment, the moral instincts "have been carefully stripped of all reasonableness?" When I asserted the Father of spirits to be the source of infinite inspiration for human effort, is this making "the Most High a Martinet" or a "Procrustus" (*sic*), "insisting upon conformity to rule at whatever cost?" Perhaps I have adduced from my former paper enough to show that my position was as far from the asceticism which sacrifices nature to morality, as from the epicureanism which degrades morality.

Mr. Cooley and I would agree so far as to find the ultimate end of existence in the "largest life and truest well-being." There is, however, a radical difference between us when we come to define or measure "well-being." What is the standard which determines it? Mr. Cooley says, happiness. To be sure, he expressly disavows hedonism. He pleads, however, in favor of eudæmonism. What does that word mean in distinction from hedonism, as applied to an ethical theory? I do not recall its use in so recent and comprehensive a work as Dr. Martineau's "Types of Ethical Theory." Mr. Cooley nowhere defines the term. We are left to gather, as best we may, what he means by it. He expresses agreement with me as to hedonism, "in so far, that is, as earthly horizons limit the view." He is, then, somewhat of a hedonist beyond the earthly horizons. His eudaemonism would seem to be equivalent to a heavenly hedonism. Be good, and you *shall* be happy hereafter.

Let it be observed, Mr. Cooley is in agreement with me as to terrestrial hedonism. Goodness for its own sake is, he implies, here the better rule. But, as to the hereafter, he believes in an-

other rule, which makes happiness supreme. Now, I ask, are the ethics of heaven opposed to the true ethics of earth? Is not goodness the same here and hereafter? If here the character is the higher which is loyal to virtue for its own sake, without regard to the pleasure of reward, is it not so there, beyond the earthly horizon? If not, when and at what point is the law reversed? Where does the repudiated hedonism end, and the advocated eudæmonism begin? The argument is not invalidated because the happiness, not directly sought, indirectly attends upon a disinterested life. That affords no reason for making happiness the aim of the life. What is true here of the pleasure of satisfaction is true hereafter. Because pleasure is a result, it does not follow that it is the cause. As well say your hunger is caused by your enjoyment of your dinner. The pleasure presupposes a desire for something, and the fulfillment of that desire. But something quite other than pleasure may have been the object desired and the motive. Strongly significant was Stuart Mill's recognition of "a sense of dignity which all human beings possess in one form or another." That sense of dignity implies a desire to be worthy rather than to feel the pleasure of so being. When Mr. Cooley adduces St. Paul's explanation of suffering, "that we may be also glorified with" Christ, does he mean to make "glorified" equivalent to being happy? Surely that glory, the shining manifestation of the sons of God, will consist not in what they shall enjoy so much as in what they shall be. It is not only to be with Christ, but moreover to be like Him. Mr. Cooley implies all that I contend for, when he speaks of Jesus "winning perfection through sufferings." There it is: perfection as the end, suffering as the means. In that same subordination I place both pleasure and pain, as the means whereby the Father educates us toward his perfection, dealing with us as with sons. That reward goes with virtue, as the shadow follows the substance, does not make it less true that the virtue is the substance and of the primary worth. The goodness is not a mere ministrant to the happiness, but happiness is the attendant. This recognition of a due precedence of goodness over pleasure seems in accord with the teaching of Christ. And I would borrow the words of Dorner, touching eschatology, "the perfection which He brings is not of eudæmonistic, but of absolute worth, and brings the spirit to its truth."¹

My criticism of hedonism was with a view to showing its inadequacy as a defense against pessimism. It is instructive to

¹ *The Person of Christ* (Clark's), vol. i. p. 146.

observe how early in the history of philosophy appears the natural transition from hedonistic to pessimistic views. The extreme hedonism of the Cyrenaic school had its development in Hegesias, "the orator of death," who taught the renunciation of life as the source of all illusion.¹ Indeed, it should be remarked that Mr. Cooley says: "If existence is to be vindicated on the arena of this world, it is to be feared the champion of pessimism will ultimately bear down all opposition, and ride victorious over the field." Now on this very field, which Mr. Cooley would thus surrender to the enemy, I sought a position which might be successfully held, ground whereon existence might be justified, the mind satisfied, the spirit braced. Immortality the pessimist would usually pronounce a dream, the "second stage of the illusion," as Hartman calls it. How, on his own field, may the pessimist be met and vanquished? There is something more universal than the conviction of immortality, and that is the recognition of moral obligation. Here, in the moral order, I found a position which, while incalculably strengthened by the hope of immortality which that moral order involves, yet has in itself the promise of victory against pessimistic attack. The attack is based upon the predominance of pain over pleasure. My position is that the purpose of life is not pleasure. It is character, perfection of nature, in Mr. Spencer's words, "the highest life," which may be resolved, as he admits,² into virtue as the aim. Even were we to grant the predominance of pain over pleasure in this life, yet, if the purpose of life be that nobility and completeness of nature, having for an ideal the divine perfection of One to whom we are related by natural kinship as sons; then, as I hold, life, even within the present sphere, is vindicated. It is invested with dignity, that is, worthiness. It is seen to be worth living. Only from that standpoint has this life such dignity. Thence viewed, furthermore, immortality becomes something far more than an expected reward. It is a necessity of the spirit that has thus already here laid hold on eternal life.

The position taken in my paper, that the true aim of existence is the highest life, consisting in virtue for its own sake, may, I think, notwithstanding Mr. Cooley's assertion to the contrary, be justified to reason. The limits of this reply oblige me to refer him to the late T. H. Green's "Prolegomena to Ethics," where that acute and noble thinker argues for "the theory of ultimate

¹ Janet et Séailles, *Histoire de la Philosophie*, p. 414.

² *Data of Ethics*, sec. 62.

good, as a perfection of the human spirit resting on the will to be perfect, which may be called, in short, the theory of virtue as an end in itself." My doctrine, which is substantially the same as Professor Green's, rests upon the possible dignity of human beings as the children of God, and upon their capability of striving toward the ideal of the divine perfection. The aim of their being is the realization of those possibilities, a certain type of character approaching conformity to that divine ideal. However far we may be below that ideal, still it is that Best that prompts and sustains the struggle after the better. It is its divine pressure that impels men upward and onward. The inspiration of goodness for its own sake, as itself the ideal, is the impulse of each step of earnest endeavor and real advance in true morality. Thus I would meet my critic's pleasantry, where he compares my ethics to climbing a mountain simply to be high up. I am not careful to defend myself against the imputation. Certainly, as a moral being, man aspires and climbs, because "to be high up is what he was made for," it is the design of his being as the child of the Most High. That divine perfection, forever above and beyond, is yet no mockery, but the sublimest of realities. To its imperative inspiration, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," human nature's response is the thrill of the noblest of aspirations, Nearer, my God, to Thee!

The promises of reward, the joy of heaven, the joy of our Lord, have their authority in the moral element, that invests them with their sacred spell and their inexhaustible preciousness. Surely in the moral background this life finds its import and its value. To the pessimist, and to my critic, who, so far as this life goes, is ready to surrender to the pessimist, I would say, Let us thank God, and take courage, because human life is so rich in possibility of moral beauty, so glorified by manifest moral purpose. Pleasure and pain are not ultimate facts of sovereign authority. Beyond them, and giving them their color and significance, is the moral fact of human personality with its divine kinship. Beyond them we may look, setting our faces toward the realization of our possibilities as sons of God:—

"Be our joys three parts pain !
Strive, and hold cheap the strain !"

Such aspiration implies strenuous devotion to that divine design and ideal. It demands loyalty to that purpose of life, which is other than pleasure because it often has to include pain, but which

suffuses life with a radiant light, wherein the inevitable pain is transfigured, until it becomes ever and again something to be chosen before anything else, because the soul sees it to partake of the highest and best, to be nearer the ideal, more like Him, the Perfect Man, who revealed the Father, and the aim of their life, to the children of God.

Chauncey B. Brewster.

BROOKLYN, NEW YORK.

EDITORIAL.**RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY.**

RECENT discussions have given a renewed interest to the subject of authority in religion. We take advantage of the occasion to indicate the nature and sources of religious authority, as we understand them.

The need of some authoritative source of truth and law for the religious life has been so generally felt in all centuries and in all lands that either sacred books or a sacred order of men have been looked to as furnishing the needed rule of life. Are we in modern times emancipated from this need? Are the enlightened conscience and reason sufficient guides, so that no objective, established standard is needed? Can each man guide himself aright, without the aid of any external authority? It may well be doubted if such a condition has been attained. While external truth must be appropriated in life to have its power, the word on the page becoming the word in the heart and mouth, yet in a condition advanced far beyond the present state, some objective reality of truth would still be needed to present the ideal character and the ultimate destination of man. A certitude is needed other than the speculations and convictions of individuals. Is there, then, any objective standard of religious truth, having authority over all men, and carrying certitude for knowledge and life? And, if so, what is that authority, and where may it be found?

What is the nature of religious authority? It is the authority of truth; nothing more than that, and also nothing less than that. It is an authority which is without external coercion. The authority of the state is supported by the arm of power, and many laws which are moral are thus enforced, such as the laws which pertain to life, property, reputation, and the like. In former times religious beliefs had the sanction of the state, and heresy or forbidden forms of worship were punished. But coercion, in respect to religion where it has existed or still exists, is an anomaly. For religion pertains to those higher aims of life which transcend civil relations in which alone the state properly has control. It should interfere less and less in that which is distinctively religious, protecting citizens in the exercise of their religion, but neither prescribing nor enforcing it. Therefore, the demand for religious authority is not the demand for that which has external sanctions and penalties, but for that which can be accepted as certain, and as furnishing the true rule of faith and practice. It is the authority, then, of truth, of objective truth, which is the same for all, and of which all may have certain knowledge; of truth, the sanctions of which reside in the constitution of man and of society, and in such anticipations or apprehensions as may be awakened concerning the future. These sanctions may have a mighty influence, but are not enforced by any positive coercion. If there is religious authority, it must be the authority of truth, and those are authoritative sources

which record unequivocally the truth concerning God in his relations to men as Lawgiver, Governor, Father, Redeemer, and Judge. That book is an authority on astronomy which accurately describes and explains the actual movements of the heavenly bodies. That man is an authority on geology who is believed to have correct and extensive knowledge of the rocky frame of the earth. Jesus spoke as one having authority, because He spoke as one who knows. That source which can give us correct knowledge of the truth is authoritative, and religious authority in the only proper sense resides in the truth which can thus be known.

The interest of our inquiry is, therefore, the interest of certitude concerning the truth which pertains to belief, character, and destiny. Can we gain such certitude? Is there any source to which we may look for the truth which is final and authoritative? Is there such truth which has been preserved in knowledge?

The inquiry may be still further limited by the assumption that in Christianity, if anywhere, such truth is to be looked for. Whatever truth there may be in other religions is embodied or implied in Christianity. And it will not be disputed that whatever religious truth may be found in the constitution of man and in the structure of society is taken for granted in Christianity. If our religion has not, certainly no other religion has the character of finality and universality. Jesus Christ declared the truth and was the truth. His teachings concerning God, duty, and destiny, and himself in his character, his sympathy, his sacrifice, as a revelation of God and the power of deliverance from sin are the truth which has authority. He stands superior to all others as teaching and exemplifying those truths which constitute religion. We will not take time to point to the reasons (which constitute the evidences of Christianity) for accepting Jesus Christ and his gospel as the essential truth of religion, because nearly all those who are interested in the subject at all, and probably all whom we address, are agreed at that point. The question we propose to discuss is the question whether it is possible to obtain correct knowledge of Him and his teachings. Are the sources of our knowledge of Christianity trustworthy sources? The truth is the truth, whether we know it or not. But it can have authority over us only if we know it. Enough may be known of Jesus to convince us that He taught the final and sufficient truth, but we may think that in many respects our knowledge of Him is inadequate, or even that we are mistaken as to his person and words, and so we may feel that, after all, there is no authoritative source of knowledge concerning Him, which is the same as having no definite, objective, infallible religious authority.

There are only three possible sources of knowledge concerning primitive Christianity, namely: the Bible, the church, and tradition. Reason, as a source of such knowledge, is excluded. It apprehends truth. It tests new truth by existing knowledge or need. But it creates no truth. It is not the objective reality, except as it is one fact among others, a fact

of the human constitution. Reason is not a source of religion, as it is not a source of astronomy. The facts being given, it constructs a science of the facts either of astronomy or religion. But religious truth and power do not emanate from man any more than the material universe emanates from the astronomer who contemplates it.

As a source of knowledge concerning Christianity, tradition need not be considered, because, practically, there is, now, no tradition. For a time it was the only dependence. The writings of the apostles, as they became known, were tested by the accepted tradition of the life and teachings of Jesus and of the belief of the church, but being found in agreement, the writings were accepted as trustworthy and took the place of tradition. The Gospels embodied the traditions, and, as they came into circulation, were relied on as sufficient sources of knowledge, and no independent traditions were preserved as authoritative. Ancient creeds may be looked on as traditions of doctrine, and the earliest creeds may be more or less independent of Scripture, but they do not profess to add to it.

The church has authority only as derived. It preserves the Scriptures, translates, teaches, interprets, but is in no sense an original source of truth. It does not profess to have received any other revelation than that recorded in the Bible, unless in some matters of ritual, or the like, but which are not considered as essentials of Christianity. It has sometimes claimed the authority of judging whether conduct and belief are in accordance with the gospel, but has claimed little more.

The Bible, then, is the source of knowledge concerning Christianity. It is the earliest body of writings, and has long been accepted by the church. But is the Bible an authoritative source of knowledge? Do we find in it the objective reality of the truth? Does it give the only perfect rule of faith and practice? Can we accept it as our religious authority? Protestantism says, Yes. Nothing is to stand between the Bible and the man. In it he finds, and finds for himself, the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. Neither church nor creed nor priesthood may claim such authority. The Bible alone has authority. This conviction is admirably expressed by an eloquent preacher of New England recently returned from foreign travel. He had said of the Bible that the truth is there, and there is the seat of our authority, and continued: "With the strength and simplicity of this position I was impressed a few weeks since. I had been hearing of authority for religious truth. Men were asking where they were to look for certitude. Echoes of this discussion came to me from this side of the sea. I was in the eternal city, where Paul preached, where the church early had its place, and where it reigned in the amplest opportunity and with all its rich and abounding magnificence. Yet there was little in the ancient church around me to enlarge or confirm my faith, or make me feel that there were men who by their office could command obedience. One rainy Sunday morning I turned into a plain Scotch Church. Only a few per-

sons were present. There was no splendor, no show, but a reverent intelligence was quietly waiting upon God. The minister arose in his place, wearing the plain black gown of his order, and opened the book which lay before him. I had seen the same thing all my life. But that morning it came home with a new meaning. I said, there is authority. A wise man and the open Bible, it is all there. He will read, and his obedient mind will be instructed. He will read, and we who listen shall be taught. If he will have it so, we shall hear the words which shall make us wise. What does an intelligent man need more than is here, — a ready mind and the Word of God? Authority, certitude, truth, he has them all who has the Holy Scriptures which were read, enlarged, explained by the Son of God. To his friends they were committed, and his friends were committed to them. The grass withereth, the world moves, the times change, but the Word of our God endures forever."

The assumption of Protestants is that the Bible has authority because it contains the Word of God, and that this can be understood by plain people as truly as by scholars. But now, increasing knowledge of the conditions under which the books of the Bible were composed seems to many to weaken if not to destroy its authority. We shall therefore compare a theory of the Bible which is of long standing with the theory which is replacing it, in order to show that the *principle* of authority is unchanged, and that the Bible, with all the knowledge we have of it, is the authentic source of knowledge concerning Christianity, and therefore still the sufficient source of religious authority.

The theory which is slowly giving way, in the face of incontestable facts, a theory which became definite not long after the Reformation, and in consequence of the enthronement of the Bible in place of the church, is the theory that the Bible is true in every part, that its every statement may be relied on as correct. The inerrancy and complete infallibility of the Bible are maintained. It therefore needs only to be studied in the light of its own teachings, by comparison of part with part, and of each part with the whole. It is found that there is progress of revelation, a broadening of truth, prediction followed by fulfillment, law superseded by grace, and many other kinds of advance. But each and every part is authoritative because true, authoritative for the kind of truth it is. The Bible, then, it has been claimed, is an authority which all can accept and use intelligently without danger of being misled. It is a source of truth which can be trusted at every point, and which invites spiritual apprehension. Its advocates contend that it is not a mechanical theory placing all truth on a dead level, but a theory clearly recognizing truth as an organism in which the various parts are of unequal value. But it is maintained that inerrancy is indispensable to the authority of the Bible. It might, perhaps, be admitted that a specific error here and there would not destroy the authority of the book, for those minor errors could be bracketed, and would not impair the integrity of

the whole, though even then, in popular apprehension, its authority would be somewhat weakened. But any larger concessions would be fatal. If there is a human and an historical coloring of the truth, if some allowance must be made for refraction in the media, if doubts are raised as to authorship and date, the Bible may still furnish food to the spiritually hungry, but is no longer an authority to which confident appeal can be made. This is a fair account of the theory which has commonly been held.

There are, therefore, two things to be considered. One is, the inerrancy. Can this be maintained? If it can, the Bible would be the kind of authority described. If it cannot, does the inference follow that the Bible would virtually lose its authority?—which is the other thing to be considered. We need not remind our readers how earnest the contention has been at the first point, nor of the harmonies, the reconciling schemes which have been put forward, from explanations of the account of the creation of the world as given in Genesis to ingenious hypotheses to account for the contradictory details of the four Gospels. We need not refer to the concessions which, most unwillingly, have been made in respect to the science, geography, and history of the Bible. Nor should blame attach to such efforts in view of supposed conditions of authority. It is not necessary to show how unsuccessful these efforts have been, nor that they have now ceased to serve any good purpose. The recorded history of the ancient peoples has shared the fortune of all historical records. Some of the historians did not have the historic sense, some of them exaggerated the past, as in the later narratives of the Chronicles, the name of Moses covers much he could not have written, the completed system of ritual was not given in the wilderness. With all minor deviations of modern Biblical critics, some such conclusions must be accepted. In the first three Gospels the accounts do not precisely tally, the Gospel of John is not an exact report of the words of Jesus, Paul's principal theological treatise is more forensic than Christ's preaching of the kingdom was, there was a mistaken expectation of the speedy coming of Christ, the Apocalypse is an obscure prophecy, some parts of which are now impossible of fulfillment. Here, again, with some unimportant deviations, there is substantial agreement. Now and then an individual of some critical ability disputes these facts, and here and there a belated denomination contends for inerrancy as earnestly as it does for the faith once delivered to the saints, but, on the whole, that side of the alternative cannot be, and is less and less likely to be, accepted.

Does it therefore follow that the Bible is not the highest and final authority, and is not an authority which can be understood and appealed to? By no means. On the contrary, the same principle of authority holds under a correct knowledge of the Bible, as under the inerrant theory, and, moreover, the principle is disengaged of conceptions which

limited and perverted it. That principle is the intrinsic truth and the saving power of essential Christianity, a principle which depends on no external support, on no particular theory of inspiration or of absolute inerrancy. This principle, as has been intimated, was really accepted under the former theory. That theory did not hold to the *equal* authority of all parts of the Bible. There was discrimination. Grades of authority were recognized. No one claimed that the Old Testament has equal importance with the New Testament, nor that the several books of the New Testament are of equal value. Some books were seen to have less truth, or less important truth, than others, the Epistle of Jude not comparing with the Epistle to the Romans, nor the Epistle to Philemon with the Fourth Gospel. A distinction was made between the doctrine of the apostles as a development from the teachings and work of Jesus, and the original, ultimate authority of what Jesus himself did and taught. That is, there was comparison, discrimination, a spiritual estimate. The most spiritual truths had the highest authority. Yet, all the while, there was the burdensome task of showing that all the parts are absolutely free from error, or even of finding a permanent value in the transient elements of the writings, and so, much fanciful interpretation. The spiritual authority of the Bible was thus weakened, because the claim of inerrancy had a tendency to obscure the important thing, the relative degrees of value and authority.

The authority, then, under the old theory, was in the spiritual saving truth of the Bible. And there it must be found on any theory. There it is found more surely than ever under the new theory. Prophets and apostles have discovered God's truth, and have declared it with such clearness that it shines in its own light. Jesus has lived and taught, has suffered and died and risen again, and stands before the world in those records which transmit his history, in those words which are spirit and life to all who will receive them, and so are self-evidencing as coming from Him who is the light of the world. If it were not so, the Bible could never have had its unsurpassed power. These revelations of spiritual and saving truth cannot be obscured by the media employed, for it is the fact that through the actual media the self-existing truth has continually been shining.

The critical sense does not disturb but aids the spiritual sense by guiding, and in some respects by correcting it. Criticism shows the historical grades of culture which conditioned the spiritual grades of knowledge. It shows the prophets as the real originators or teachers of the truth, and the ritual, in its technical completeness, as belonging in fact not to the period of origins, but to the period of stagnation which followed, — and thus what was always felt to be greater regains its probable and natural place. Criticism shows that ignorance and error, in some respects, were inevitable in certain ages, and that they are important signs of the reality and verisimilitude of that which is narrated, that we

should suspect later tamperings if modern knowledge appeared in ancient writings, that such freedom from error would be unnatural rather than supernatural. It is much more important that the picture of religious life and belief should be faithful, and therefore should have been taken, as it were, on the spot, than that it should be free from all blemishes. The paradox is perfectly reasonable that our confidence in the story rests, in part, on its untruthfulness. If there were no mistakes about the heavens and the earth and the nations around, we should suspect that some monk of the Middle Ages, or some officious Jewish scribe, had been meddling. Criticism shows the influence of personal media as refracting or even coloring truth, and thus promotes the comprehension of it. The old theory had to recognize such influences, and so, for example, distinguished the Pauline from the Johannean theology. But John rendered a service in amplifying the words of Jesus. Perhaps, as given, they were seeds which needed to fall upon the heart of a mystic, and to germinate in life, and to be reflected on through years in order to be preserved in the knowledge of later generations. Did Jesus really say this and that as written in the Fourth Gospel? Perhaps not, in precisely that form. But He said something like that. It bears marks of coming from the mind of Jesus as we know Him in the other Gospels, and we have, as it were, the commentary of the profoundest mystic who ever lived. The theologizing of John shows also how soon believers assigned a divine character to Jesus. An early doctrinal development is given us as flowing naturally from knowledge of the very self-consciousness of Jesus. And, on the other hand, if the style and mode of expression seem somewhat unlike the simplicity of Jesus, it is a relief to know that the thought is his, rather than its full development. We are studying Christ's words, in part as He uttered them, and in part through their effects on a man of deep meditation after years of reflection. Thus we are the better able to penetrate into the consciousness of Jesus. His authority stands out more clear and commanding than ever. There is not merely an iteration of words found elsewhere, but a development of the truth He spoke. It is not necessary to give other examples of the service criticism renders in restoring the living reality of spiritual truth.

There has been, then, an evolution of the principle of authority. There was always some recognition of grades of authority, corresponding with degrees of spiritual power in the truth itself. The principle was encumbered by the fancied necessity of maintaining the absolute inerrancy of all parts of the Bible. To distinguish seemed like pulling up tares at the risk of destroying the wheat. But facts will have their way, and inerrancy can no longer be claimed. Then criticism comes in and shows why there are grades of authority, that it is on account of the gradualness of religious education, the way in which literature grows, the historical and human conditions under which alone truth could be real to men. And it shows the wondrous thing, that, without overriding the

faculties and conditions of men, a divine gospel has been proclaimed, a divine person has been among men, a divine redemption has been achieved, that expectations were awakened early which had a growing fulfillment till the stream of prophecy widened into the verity of history.

Now, then, what shall be said to the people? How can we refer them to a Bible, part of which is no better than other books, and all of which has been subjected to the vicissitudes of time? There is only one thing to do. Tell them the truth. The honest course is the only safe and wise course. They already know the facts in part. It is useless, and worse, to keep on saying that there is no error and no imperfection. Insist on that, and they will soon think that nothing is certain. That very claim has given great occasion to the enemy. We ourselves are of the number of the people, and what we have been able to understand others may understand. It is a purely imaginary public which cannot be trusted with the truth, by no means the intelligent and teachable public of which we who write and you who read these lines are part. In a word, invite discrimination in the use of the Bible, a discrimination of the spirit from the letter, of the permanent from the transient. The letter of inerrancy killeth. The spirit of saving truth maketh alive. It is an advantage that apprehension of the modes in which truth was conveyed to the world frequently changes, for thus the necessity of searching out, in Scripture, the living truth which, in changing forms, abideth forever is laid upon all who would have eternal life. If the truth which has authority is not there, it is useless to look for it. If it is there, no fear but that it will be found and felt. The magnitude of truth as it stands reported in the New Testament is in no danger of being overlooked, or of being seriously misunderstood.

According to the report of a sermon recently preached on the decadence of authority, it was said that the authority of the Bible must be reasserted, but the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount were singled out as examples. It was quite evident that the preacher did not claim that the whole Bible is authoritative, but that final authority is to be found there, and only there, and that its saving truth can easily be known. This is all that should be contended for, but it is everything. The question is not as to the perfect correctness of every part of the Bible, but as to its being an authority at all. Does it contain *any* truth which is certain and authoritative? We claim that it does, and that all the facts of its origin, history, and composition make it easy to ascertain the essential truth of that gospel which Jesus gave to the world.

Then it will be asked (since not the whole, but only part, of the Bible is true), whether each individual may not take what he likes, disregarding the rest, and so recognize no objective authority after all, but follow his own fancy alone? Will not every one accept only the truth which he approves? Will he not decide for himself? Ultimately, yes. Certainly no other can decide for him. But it may be assumed that the truth

which is essential will be approved by honest minds. And the truth remains true, whether misguided man approves it or not. Let God be found true, but every man a liar. The individual must take the consequence of disregarding truth. No outward power coerces him, but he will be an unrenewed man, and will suffer the loss which comes from disregarding the law of God, which is the true law of his own being. Under the old theory of inerrancy there is no power which can oblige any one to believe the truth, and the final appeal for acceptance of it is to the reason and conscience of the individual. And when he has assented to the theory of infallibility, he has still to discriminate the spiritual from the literal. Under the new theory, as well as under the old, it may be expected that due respect will be given to the estimation in which the Bible has been held in the church and in Christian society through the centuries. But certainly, while reason and conscience have no authority as sources of truth, they are the authority to which the final decision of all beliefs and practices must be taken by the individual man.

We therefore maintain that the facts about the Bible should be admitted and explained, as suitable occasion offers, and that people should be led to make the necessary discrimination between the permanent and the transient. Some clergymen say they have no time to investigate on critical lines. That might be doubted, in view of the attention they give to many unimportant matters. But, if they have no time for original research, let them accept the agreeing results of competent scholarship, and not decry those who are capable of examining the sources of religious knowledge. We again emphasize what we have been glad to affirm more than once before, that preachers do more than any other class of men in maintaining the authority of the Bible, by impressing that truth which has spiritual power. It is their function to study the Bible for that purpose. The preacher holding the open book, as described in the passage quoted above, selects such portions of the Word as can make men wise unto salvation. The word which has authority is the word which can be preached, and the living preacher, such as, in an eminent sense, is he from whom we quoted, keeps the authority of truth alive. Such preachers do not handle the Word of God deceitfully, professing that it is what it is not, but by manifestation of the truth commend themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

The desire for a book which is superhuman throughout, and therefore free from all human error and imperfection, is the desire for some external sign of authority which is no real part of essential saving truth. With the demand for visible signs Jesus had no sympathy, but seemed to be discouraged by it. "And he sighed deeply in his spirit, and saith, Why doth this generation seek a sign? Verily, I say unto you, there shall no sign be given unto this generation."

Let it be enough for us that there is spiritual, saving truth, which is easily found by him who is willing to receive it. Our fathers said that

the Bible contains the Word of God. They were not thinking whether all the Bible, or only part of it, is the Word of God. They meant that it is contained in the Bible, and is not contained anywhere else. Enough that it is somewhere. Even if in the Bible it is as treasure hid in a field, we should search for it where it is to be found, and should search for it until it is found.

LEWIS FRENCH STEARNS.

PROFESSOR STEARNS, of the Bangor Theological Seminary, died February 9, 1892, after a short illness. The loss to that institution, to theology, and to the Christian church is very great. He was in early middle life, in the vigor of all his powers, and in the ripeness of culture, and had already given to the world some of the results of his attainments. His book entitled "The Evidence of Christian Experience," is a thoroughly wrought work on Apologetics in a line which had scarcely been opened in America or England. This treatise gave the author a wide and high reputation as a theologian. It will stand for many years as the best exposition of the fundamental argument for Christianity. He was engaged on a life of the late Henry B. Smith, and had finished the preparation of it for the press, so that, as we are glad to learn, it will soon be published. His address at the recent Congregational Convention in London was considered by some who heard it the best of the meeting. He was under appointment as preacher before the American Board of Foreign Missions, and had been elected to, but had declined, the professorship of Systematic Theology in the Union Seminary of New York. The appreciation in which Dr. Stearns was held, both by the Presbyterian and Congregational denominations, at home and abroad, indicates how serious a loss to the cause he served his death must be considered. This brief notice is no attempt to analyze his character and methods, a task which we hope will be undertaken by one of his colleagues. We wish only to express our sense of loss, and our sympathy with another seminary of our own denomination. We cannot refrain, however, from mentioning the occasion when he received information of his election to the theological chair in Union Seminary. He was visiting the writer of this note, and had no definite expectation of being chosen at all, least of all at that time. After a protracted conference with two of the Trustees, he talked freely of the proposal. The transparent conscientiousness, the humility, the absence of any personal ambition, the entire satisfaction he felt in the work he was already doing, the consideration he showed for his associates at Bangor were simply beautiful. It was not easy to decline such an invitation from an institution of which his father was one of the founders, and to which he was drawn by many personal interests, as well as by the wide field of influence it opened to him. But he at once felt the force of objections growing largely out of theological opinion, and which

proved decisive in the end. And so he went on, with all his heart, in the work to which he returned.

When so rare a man dies in the midst of his usefulness, we may well believe that he is called to a larger intellectual and spiritual service, for which his earthly experience had been the best possible training.

THE CHRISTIAN ACADEMY.

THE prosperity which at present attends our schools of every grade is extraordinary. It is not alone the few great institutions that are thronged with students, but the smaller, and even the smallest, show surprising gains. There is much reason in the remark that our most prosperous institutions to-day are not the banks, the factories, the mines, the railroads, but our institutions of learning. The officers of many of these institutions say they cannot explain this large and unexpected increase. It is not the growth of the strong at the expense of the weak, nor the result of great prosperity in business, nor is it due to forced methods of securing patronage, nor to any sudden call for educated men. Learning, however, is becoming in some sense a fashion. The Muses which were silent amid the din of arms are again tuneful. A stable order of business and of government fosters the quiet pursuits of learning, and young men, being no longer led on by the dream of sudden fortune or swift promotion, turn into the sober paths which lead through discipline to power. The exaltation of character and of service, at the present day, makes the long, hard courses of preparation attractive to young men and women who take life seriously and who desire to live nobly. This clearer estimate of values and the desire to be morally worthy and useful have touched many minds, otherwise frivolous, and turned them to courses of study, long and severe.

The schools are not only thronged, they are also receiving great gifts. Columbia with nine millions, Harvard with seven, Yale with five, new universities springing up here and there with millions at the very outset, almost every morning bringing a record of some new educational benefaction, while multitudes of smaller gifts go unheralded to their unostentatious uses, — all this goes to show that learning is established already on solid foundations, and has won a large place in the benevolence of this generation.

But neither numbers nor wealth are sufficient to make an era or to mark an epoch. It is the growth of the scholarly temper, the love of learning, and, better still, the love of truth, the zeal and passion for research, the fearlessness of just criticism, and the patience of constructive thinking, which have made modern methods of education fruitful, and modern schools the centre of light and life, of a moral and intellectual activity such as has never been before so diffused and controlling, touching at once so many individuals and expressing itself in so many ways, through every range of human interest.

All this prosperity and all this life is felt measurably by the schools next below the colleges, although they do not touch the imagination like the colleges, nor have they developed a separate personality — so to speak — toward which memory turns back, and around which affection gathers. They have been so feeble, so small, so dependent, so inconstant, and have been used to answer so many distinct, not to say conflicting, ends, that, as a whole, they have never had the recognition which belongs to them as a separate group of schools, and only a few of them, individually, have had the recognition which they have merited on account of conspicuous service in a definite, difficult, and important field.

Under recent changes, however, — the evolution of the university, the higher education of women, the differentiation of the scientific and technical schools, and the general flow of benefactions to worthy establishments of every grade on the ground of their present usefulness or their promise, — many of these secondary schools, especially those which are distinctively preparatory, have acquired a new dignity and commanded popular attention. New ones have been founded, old ones strengthened, and languishing ones revived. It has been shown that the public high school does not meet every requirement, and that our diversified life calls for a variety of mutually helpful agencies.

Among those who regard education from the religious point of view, the recent discussion of the place and claims of the Christian academy has created special interest. "The New West Education Commission" has expended much effort in the planting of Christian academies at centres of influence in the newer sections of the country, and has conducted the experiment long enough to show substantial and satisfactory success, and the home missionary authorities in the new States have adopted a similar policy. By more recent action of "The College and Education Society," academies are taken into the fostering care of that organization. Many notable testimonies are cited as to the value of the academy in our educational systems. With only here and there a discordant note, the public schools have received their due amount of praise, and it is distinctly avowed that the academy is not to supplant or rival the public high school, but to supplement it, to cover ground which the high school does not reach, and to do work which is not provided for, and cannot be provided for, in a scheme of public instruction.

Another point not always guarded in the advocacy of the Christian academy is the use of arguments which would justify parochial schools, established by church authority, in distinct subversion of the public school system, and claiming a share of the public school money, or exemption for their patrons from taxation for the support of public schools. It is no part of the scheme of the Christian academy, as it is no part of the scheme of the Christian college, to make war upon the public school system, to impair its efficiency, or subtract from its financial support; nor to create or perpetuate class distinctions, whether of wealth, or family,

or nationality, or religion. Any argument which can be construed to the support of unpatriotic bigotry is not a sound argument for the Christian academy.

But the Christian purpose of the academy is a proper motive for its establishment. It is first of all to promote good learning, and no other inspirations to industry, order, sacrifice, devotion, equal those which are drawn from our holy religion. *Bene orasse est bene studuisse.* If it were consistent with the genius of our government, with our theory of a complete separation of church and state, to give distinctively religious instruction in our schools, we should ally all the forces of piety with those of morality to stimulate the intellect and to perfect the character of our youth. The Rev. Dr. Brand, in an excellent address delivered last May in Cleveland, — an address which has called out this article, — puts the matter extremely well : —

“ I gladly concede that the public school system indirectly aids religion ; for whatever promotes general intelligence helps in some degree the cause of Christ. The personal influence of Christian teachers is also a factor in the promotion of Christianity. But the school system, as such, is a function of the state, and theoretically has no reference to religion. Its aim in all its departments, as supported by taxation, is to promote general intelligence, in order to promote good citizenship and stable government. It proposes to Americanize foreigners, to assimilate heterogeneous elements of population to the spirit of our institutions, and to promote success and intelligent thrift in the individual. The State University, sustained and controlled in the same way, has substantially the same aim. The object of the whole system is largely political. It promotes civilization, and as such it has a noble and far-reaching influence. Its importance to the Republic cannot be overestimated.”

It is also to be said that moral training, which is something far other than training in minor morals, has been made a prominent feature in our schools, perhaps more prominent from the fact that in so many parts of the country religious exercises have been forbidden. The discipline of the will has become a distinct aim, and in recent teachers' meetings no other subject has received so full treatment or called forth more interesting and profitable discussion. It is not impossible that better results will be reached, than under the superficial and perfunctory religious instruction so often carelessly given under the old method, and that “ pure religion and undefiled,” Christianity itself, in its spirit and life, will be brought to bear even more effectively upon the pupils' minds and hearts.

The claim of the Christian academy is presented by Dr. Brand in the following eloquent paragraph : —

“ Historically, it is beyond dispute that the Christian academy has been one of the strongest bulwarks against materialism — one of the most efficient promoters of the cause of Christ in this country. New England owes quite as much to her academies as to her colleges. They are independent of political control. They are founded by Christian philanthropists, with a distinctly Christian aim, and taught by Christian educators. Their aim is not simply to

make American citizens, or quick-witted breadwinners, or smart politicians, but high-minded men. They believe in the idea of the symmetry of human nature, the proper adjustment of spiritual and material. They see that purely secular schools do not necessarily improve a sin-cursed race. There is a 'moral illiteracy' which is infinitely more dangerous than the intellectual, and which the spelling book and multiplication table cannot remove. The infinite evil which lies upon our nature is not ignorance, but sin. He is not a wise educator who trains a man's hand and eye and brain, and thus puts a club within his grasp, unless he can at the same time put a clear thought, a right heart under his blouse. The aim and influence of the Christian academy is not to supplant the secular with the spiritual, but to combine the two. Hence the beneficent effect of the New England academy in the past. It takes boys and girls at the most critical, transitional period of their lives, and equips them with secular learning and Christian ethics at the same time. It is a *private* school, so far as the state is concerned, but broad and unsectarian, and therefore unlike the narrow sectarian spirit of the Catholic parochial school. The Christian academy is on a basis similar to that of the Christian college, and its influence is practically the same. The profounder views of life inculcated at the academy, the greater thoughtfulness, the larger and juster outlook which it promotes, as compared with the ordinary high school, are always favorable to Christianity. The result is that revivals of religion are promoted as they cannot be under the public school system supported by the state. Hence the large proportion of boys and girls who have gone out from these academies, whether they entered college or not, have gone out with a Christian purpose, with broad and serious views of life and duty, and with a catholicity of spirit seldom attained in the more secular high school."

It is for reasons like these that appeals are made for the reendowment of our academies, and for the establishment of new ones. Their importance is greater than formerly on account of the enlargement and enrichment of their courses of study. The colleges look to them for men well prepared for college life and college studies. The amount of work laid upon them, and the grade of it, requires a teaching staff and equipment not inferior to that furnished to our colleges a generation ago. The appeal for our academies, accordingly, is substantially the same as for our colleges. Their relations are intimate and their aims common. In some respects it is more important that the instruction in the schools be of the first order of merit, the encouragements to struggling talent even more ample and free than in the colleges. For the foundations of character and scholarship are laid in the schools. England has set us a noble example in the strong endowment of a group of secondary schools, whose teachers rival in distinction and influence those of the universities, and whose pupils enjoy the best that all England can supply.

HOW MUCH DID THE AMERICAN BOARD MEAN IN GRANTING TO THE PRUDENTIAL COMMITTEE LIBERTY TO ASK "SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS"?

THE American Board, at its Annual Meeting in Minneapolis (1890), made the following changes in the doctrinal handling of candidates for missionary appointment. Those changes were adopted upon the recommendation of the "Committee of Nine on the Methods of Administration at the Rooms of the American Board." The two questions in the Manual for Missionary Candidates were modified to read:—

"Question 1. What are your views respecting each of the leading doctrines of Scripture commonly held by the churches sustaining this Board? In answering this question you may use your own language or refer to any creeds of acknowledged weight as to the doctrine contained in these creeds.

"Question 2. Have you any views at variance with these doctrines, or any views of church government which would prevent your cordial coöperation with the missionaries of this Board?"

The Report of the Committee then continues:—

"These questions being so amended, all application for missionary appointment shall be made, as now, to the Corresponding Secretaries of the Board. Without further correspondence on doctrinal matters the communications thus received by the Secretaries shall be presented forthwith to the Prudential Committee. In case the Committee desire further scrutiny into the theological opinions of the candidate, this shall be had through an interview with the Committee as a body; or, in case this in any special instance is not practicable, with a sub-committee appointed by them from their own number, and consisting in part of laymen. At such theological examination by the Committee or sub-committee, the doors shall be open for the presence of any members of the Board or personal friends of the candidate."

The matter, upon which we now ask for light, is contained in the following amendment to this report, to be inserted after the sentence, "In case the Committee desire further scrutiny into the theological opinions of the candidate," *they may address to him such supplementary questions as appear to them important, and if further light is needed, etc., etc.*

The occasion of our inquiry is the method of the Prudential Committee in two recent cases, showing its interpretation of the action of the Board at Minneapolis. Until these cases, we had not known what method the Committee were pursuing in its examination of candidates. We will outline them as they have come to our notice, that our readers may understand the ground of our disquietude.

November 16, 1891, A. B., of the Senior Class in Andover Theological Seminary, offered himself as an applicant to the Board for missionary appointment. His application was made in the usual form, and was accompanied by full personal statements in regard to health, and by an equally full statement of an examining physician. For his theological views the candidate referred, according to the suggestions of the Report adopted at Minneapolis, to the following creeds: The Apostles', the

Nicene, the Congregational Creed of 1883, and on November 28 he added the Burial Hill Declaration of 1865.

December 30, 1891, he received the following letter, enumerating certain supplementary questions : —

BOSTON, December 30, 1891.

MR. — — — — —, *Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.* :

MY DEAR BROTHER, — Your offer of service as missionary, together with similar offers from several other persons, was laid upon the table of the Prudential Committee some weeks since, but a great pressure of business has prevented the consideration of these papers 'till the meeting held yesterday afternoon. This delay has been much regretted, but could not be helped.

At the reading of the papers yesterday, notice was taken of the fact that in three cases, your own among the number, the creeds to which the candidates referred do not make explicit reference to some points upon which the Committee has uniformly asked an expression of the views of those who desire missionary appointment. The Committee, therefore, requested me, as clerk, to ask from you, as from others, a brief statement of your views on the following topics : —

1. The inspiration and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures.
2. The immortality of the soul.
3. The decisiveness of the present life as related to final destiny.

Please find inclosed a stamped envelope for your reply.

Trusting that the way will soon be opened for your entering the service of Christ in some foreign land, I am,

In behalf of the Prudential Committee,

Very truly yours,

E. E. STRONG, *Clerk.*

January 2, 1892, he replied as follows to the questions proposed : —

ANDOVER, MASS., January 2, 1892.

DR. E. E. STRONG, *Boston* :

DEAR SIR, — Yours of December 30, in regard to my application to the Prudential Committee, is received.

I reply to the queries regarding my doctrinal views, permit me to say, that in my application I expressed "hearty assent" to the two creeds of the catholic church of most "acknowledged weight," the Apostles' and the Nicene; and, so far as I am aware, with the single exception of the Savoy Declaration, to the only two authorized Congregational confessions of faith, the Burial Hill Declaration of 1865, and the Creed of 1883. I know of no creeds of more "acknowledged weight" to which I could have referred.

As to the specific doctrines in question, I would answer as follows : —

1. The subject of the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures seems to me to be covered in any fair interpretation by Art. V. of the Creed of 1883.

I believe that the Holy Scriptures were composed by men under the special inspiration of the spirit of God; that they contain the only record of God's redemptive work in the world, culminating in Christ; that they are vitally related to that work; that, therefore, they contain the final and perfect revelation of the nature of God, of his will for man, and of the way of salvation; that in this sense, and this sense alone, are they infallible.

2. The subject of the immortality of the soul seems to me to be covered in any fair interpretation by Art. XII. of the Creed of 1883.

I believe that the soul is by nature immortal ; that the issues of the judgment are in accordance with Christian character, and are final ; and I see no reason to suppose that the wicked and the righteous do not alike exist eternally, conscious of their state.

3. I do not believe that the Scriptures teach the universal "decisiveness of the present life as related to final destiny." I believe that they do teach the availability of the atonement of Christ for the salvation of every child of the race, and that salvation is through faith in Christ alone. Defining the terms Christ, salvation, and faith as they have ordinarily been defined in Congregational churches, the corollary seems to me inevitable that the offer of Christ will be made in the other life to those to whom it has not been made in this life. With this view the intimations which the Scriptures contain seem to me to coincide. Modifying the definition of these terms gives the "essential Christ" view, so called. I do not feel inclined to so radical a course as departure from the long-held definition of the terms, Christ, salvation, and faith.

But the conditions of the other life seem to me involved in such mystery, and to be so incompletely revealed in Scripture, that I hold no view on this subject dogmatically, or as more than a probability.

Hoping that these answers may prove satisfactory to the Committee, I am,
Yours respectfully,

January 13, 1892, his application was declined on personal grounds, including health.

On January 18, 1892, C. D., of the Senior Class in Andover Theological Seminary, offered himself as an applicant to the Board for missionary appointment. The application was made in the usual form, and was accompanied by full statements from himself and friends in regard to health, and by the statement of an examining physician. For his theological views the candidate referred to the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Burial Hill Declaration (supplemented by the additions made at the Oberlin Council), which, we believe, Dr. Dexter characterized as "the flag of the denomination," and to the Congregational Creed of 1883.

February 10, 1892, the candidate received in reply this letter from the Prudential Committee : —

AM. BOARD OF COM. FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS.

CONGREGATIONAL HOUSE, 1 SOMERSET STREET,
BOSTON, February 10, 1892.

MR. — — — — —, *Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.:*

MY DEAR BROTHER, — Your offer of service and accompanying testimonials were presented to the Prudential Committee at its meeting of last week, February 2, but the docket was so crowded that they were not reached till the session of yesterday. On two or three points the Committee desired further information, and I am instructed, as clerk, to ask from you a brief expression of your views on the following topics : —

1. The inspiration of the Scriptures.
2. The immortality of the soul.
3. The decisiveness of the present life as related to future destiny.

Will you be kind enough to indicate briefly your views on these points, and send your reply to me in the inclosed stamped envelope.

I am, very truly yours,
In behalf of the Prudential Committee,
E. E. STRONG, Clerk.

To the points raised in this letter of inquiry the candidate made reply, February 13, as follows: —

1. I believe that the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only inspired record of that final revelation of God's redemption, which culminated in Jesus Christ, and are therefore of supreme authority in matters of faith and practice.
2. I believe in the natural immortality of the soul.
3. I do not minimize in the slightest the tendency of "the present life" to fix character and to decide "future destiny," but I believe that the final destiny of the soul is fundamentally determined by its personal relation to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, rather than upon its external environment in any point of time.

February 24, 1892, the application was declined on the ground of health.

The successive refusal of these candidates on the ground of health suggests two incidental inquiries. First, whether it would not be advisable, the candidate having made his theological statement, to suspend "further scrutiny into his theological opinions" until the question of his health has been settled, especially in cases where the health question promises to be serious. Second, whether, in view of the high standard of the Board in the matter of health, some special notification of health requirements should not be made to theological students. The second of the above cases was declined on the ground that the candidate would not be a first-class risk in a Life Insurance Company on account of *heredity*, the fact being that two brothers and a sister had died from causes which involved or suggested pulmonary trouble. But the parents of the applicant and three brothers and a sister are living in robust health, the candidate himself has the reputation among his fellow-students of an athlete, and an older brother, a student in Princeton Theological Seminary, has just been appointed by the Presbyterian Board with full knowledge of the same facts upon which the older brother was rejected. We do not charge that the Prudential Committee has made an unjust discrimination in this case, for we have no knowledge of the basis on which it has proceeded in recent appointments, but we would suggest that if Life Insurance rules are to be the standard of appointment it should be so understood, in order that applicants may present an insurance policy with other requisite papers.

But these questions are incidental. We make our present inquiry, because the cases which we have cited have uncovered a method of procedure of which we had no previous knowledge, about which at some points

we desire further information, and against which, so far as we understand its working, we desire to utter our protest.

We ask, in the first place, of those who are competent to answer, whether the method of "supplementary questions" was designed to be mandatory or permissive. The language seems to us clearly permissive. "In case the committee desire further scrutiny into the theological opinions of the candidate they *may* address to him such supplementary questions as appear to them important." But we understand that the position is taken that the action at Minneapolis calls for a more critical and extended theological examination than was formerly demanded by the Board; the assumption being that the somewhat elaborate machinery for examination which was there set up to guard against some questionable practices must be used to its full extent.

We ask, in the second place, what is the nature of the "supplementary questions" which the committee "may address" to the candidate for missionary appointment. This is a very vital inquiry in the light of the "supplementary questions" put to applicants in these successive cases, for it will be seen that these questions lie, in their intention, outside the working theology of the creeds, and within the region of present critical and philosophical discussion. Does the Board wish its Committee to enter this region? The questions actually proposed are as divisive as any which could have been asked. We cannot see that the Committee has passed by any subject calculated to raise a theological difficulty, except, possibly, the question of evolution. Does the Board wish its Committee to engage in this philosophical hunt after divisive issues? To be more specific. Does the Board desire to take part in the questions of Biblical and historical criticism which underlie the subject of the "inspiration and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures"? Does the Board wish to divide its constituency over the question of conditioned "immortality"? Does the Board wish to perpetuate the controversy over "the decisiveness of the present life as related to final destiny"? These are the precise issues which are involved in the putting of these questions.

Take the question about inspiration. What is the question of inspiration apart from the doctrine of Sacred Scripture to which the candidates had subscribed in the creeds referred to? The Congregational Creed of 1883 says of the Scriptures: "We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the record of God's revelations of himself in the work of redemption; that they were written by men under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit; that they are able to make wise unto salvation; and that they constitute the authoritative standard by which religious teaching and human conduct are to be regulated and judged." Each of the applicants in question had subscribed to this statement, and in the after statement called for could do no more than to substantially reaffirm it. What more ought to be asked? Who is prepared to give a philosophical definition of inspiration when the very material out of which such a definition must be framed is in a reformatory state?

And what of the second question, that of immortality, or as it evidently means of conditional immortality? As our readers are aware, the belief in conditional immortality is not a belief which we are inclined to advocate, but it is a belief which is held by a large and increasing part of the constituency of the American Board. It is held by its advocates as a philosophical interpretation of future destiny, respecting which the creeds make no affirmation. Does the Board wish to have its Committee raise this question as another question upon which to divide its constituency? We had supposed that by general consent this particular question was not to be pressed. If we are not mistaken, two of the Secretaries of the Board, one of them being the Home Secretary, were asked, under examination by one of the Committee of Nine, if, in their opinion, another applicant holding this belief (reference was made to an applicant from a neighboring seminary who had been practically rejected on this ground) would be rejected, and they both replied that they thought not, at least not by their advice. We see, then, no reason for introducing this question, except to prepare the way for the one which follows.

If these and like questions are asked in mere intellectual curiosity, as they are sometimes asked at councils, we submit that the action is beneath the dignity of the Prudential Committee. If they are asked as test questions, upon the answer to which the appointment of the applicant is conditioned, we submit that they are irrelevant to the purpose of the American Board. They are outside that great working theology which makes up the faith commonly held by the churches sustaining the Board. And the liberty even to ask such questions makes the Committee of the Board, as Dr. Hopkins used to say, not a prudential, but a theological committee, and he might now have added a philosophical committee. We believe that as the churches come to understand the significance of this kind of questioning, they will make themselves heard in a protest which cannot be disregarded.

As to the last of the "supplementary questions," that of "the decisiveness of the present life as related to future destiny," we qualify the general assumption, upon which we have thus far written, that all these questions are put lie outside the province of the Board. Without waiving our original and constant position that this question, because outside the creeds, is outside the province of the Board, we admit that the Board has brought it within its supposed province. We admit that it has passed resolutions advising caution in the acceptance of those holding the possibility of a Christian probation for all souls. We admit that these resolutions have not been repealed, and that the Prudential Committee have the letter of the instructions of the Board as their warrant for scrutiny into the opinions of candidates upon this point. But, having made these admissions, we ask, in the third place, does the method of the Prudential Committee, in putting these supplementary questions, including the last,

really express and represent the present mind of the constituency of the American Board? Events of no mean import have taken place since the resolutions, to which we have referred, were passed at Des Moines and reaffirmed at Springfield. Within its own history the meeting at New York has occurred and the meeting at Minneapolis. What was the moral significance of these meetings? Did they, or did they not, mean a substantial change in the theological policy of the Board, acting through its Prudential Committee? Unfortunately this is the practical question with which we are still confronted. It has, indeed, been generally assumed that the American Board question was settled, and in the interest of harmony and peace. Calls for men and appeals for money have been made upon this understanding. We ourselves have tried to believe, without any actual evidence to justify our faith, that the management of the Board was seeking to adjust itself to the change of policy which had been declared to be a fact. But the exposure of the method still pursued at the rooms of the Prudential Committee obliges us to conclude that there has been no real change there. The transfer of power from the Home Secretary to the Prudential Committee is seen to be nominal; the Home Secretary and the majority of the Prudential Committee are one and the same. We see no reason to suppose that if a case like that of Mr. Noyes or of Mr. Covell were to be presented there would not be the same conflict as in those cases. This at least is not harmony and peace within, and until there is harmony and peace within, there cannot be harmony and peace without. The spirit and tendency and method of the majority of the Prudential Committee, as accidentally brought to light in its use of the liberty of "supplementary questions," will awaken grave suspicions and fears on the part of many true friends of Foreign Missions.

NOTES FROM ENGLAND.

THE wide interest which Englishmen take in religious affairs is always finding fresh illustration. One fact of to-day is the increasing number of religious periodicals. A few months ago the "Review of the Churches" was started; it gives articles on current questions, has symposia by men of widely different views, and each month records the progress and chief events relating to the different denominations of the Christian Church in Great Britain; even the Salvation Army is not neglected. Besides, there is a notable feature in the editorial work being intrusted to six gentlemen representing the chief Christian bodies of our country, excepting, of course, the Roman Catholic. Two other magazines which are just appearing are "The New Era," which will be devoted to philanthropic and social work on broad lines; and "The Thinker," which will endeavor to keep its readers well abreast of the march of theological thought and literature, not only in our own land but in other countries;

it also makes itself attractive to the minister, who is pressed for time to compose his sermons, by being strong on the homiletical side. Judging from the first number, "The Thinker" may be reckoned not only as a scholarly production, but as an organ of progressive orthodoxy. It contains a very full notice of recent American theology under the heading of "Current American Thought."

The publishing record for 1891 shows that there were 520 new theological works (including sermons) published in our country during last year, and 107 new editions of theological works were issued. It is interesting to note that during the year 4,429 new books, and 1,277 new editions were published in all departments of literature. These numbers show a slight decrease from those for 1890, a result due, it is believed, mainly to the depression of the general trade of the country.

In recent theological literature we have three notable books, in Professor Driver's "Introduction to the Old Testament," Professor Cheyne's work on the Psalms, and Canon Gore's on the Incarnation. The first two of these show that the theological work of Oxford professors is not now entirely, as it used to be, along merely traditional lines and contemptuous of Continental scholarship; the third confirms the impression which was roused by "Lux Mundi," that the Anglo-Catholic movement, though it was in its earlier stages so disdainful of metaphysics, and professed to be so amply self-satisfied in having "the faith once delivered to the saints," is beginning to seek a philosophical foundation for the ecclesiastical edifice which it rears.

Another work which has just appeared, and is significant, coming at the present time, is Dr. A. Duff's "Old Testament Theology from 800 B. c. to 640 B. c." (Edinburgh, 1891). Dr. Duff discusses the theology and moral teaching of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah, their relation to the Pentateuch, and their place in the order of divine revelation. Critical conclusions and deep spiritual and moral insight combine in a degree and manner not usual in theological writings: and perhaps the most valuable aspect of the book is in its showing that critical theology may be full of moral and spiritual enthusiasm.

The Salvation Army has been recently showing even more than its usual evidences of vigor. General Booth has been on a tour of our colonies, and has visited South Africa and Australia, where his reception has partaken of the nature of a triumphal procession or a royal progress. Meanwhile, the Salvation Army at home have been engaged in a struggle of great importance. At Eastbourne, a fashionable watering-place on the south coast, "the Army" has been prevented from, or at least hampered in its usual course of leading processions through the streets with music and banners and of holding open air services, by the fact that the corporation of the town, in obtaining a local act from Parliament, received the unusual powers of stopping such demonstrations in the public thoroughfares. As there can be no doubt that Parliament was not generally aware that such exceptional powers were being granted, and that the Englishman's feeling of fair play is against a special law, good only for one town, and surreptitiously passed in order to be used against a definite body of not unworthy citizens, the persistent determination of the corporation to prevent the Salvation Army doing there what it does without hindrance everywhere else has led to riots, criminal prosecutions, civil law-

suits, and an unenviable notoriety for the pleasant town of Eastbourne. How this matter will end, it is hard to say, but the circumstances have already shown that the Salvation Army are in grim earnest, not readily deterred from any course which they once adopt, and that among the quiet, respectable, and unenthusiastic portion of the community the religious worship of the Salvation Army is very unpopular, and worthy, if possible, of stern repression.

There has been published the first year's review of the work of the "Darkest England" scheme. That a very vast organization, with many ramifications, has sprung rapidly into being and is now in wide-spreading activity is amply shown. A few figures show at once how great is the philanthropic work of the Salvation Army : The Cheap Food Depots have supplied 2,606,548 meals, of which 25,000 have been free ; at the Shelters the total number of cheap lodgings for the homeless has been 307,000 ; the number of visits to families in the slums has been 445,170. It appears that General Booth is asking for 30,000 pounds a year for the continuance and carrying on of his work, though the general impression was that the "Darkest England" scheme was to be self-supporting when once the initial sum was subscribed. This report, however, gives so much evidence of marvelous work done, that there can only be one feeling of hope, that this work will not fail for lack of funds.

The last few months of the year 1891 have been very full of interest in our political sphere. Great changes have been wrought by death amongst the leaders of the House of Commons ; but in the second place, the questions connected with our rural districts and their population have come very strongly into prominence. These questions, indeed, are very complex : they are largely economic and social as well as political ; our land is going out of cultivation ; it is found more profitable to, or perhaps it is more to the taste of, the wealthy merchants who buy up estates in the country, to rear game than to grow corn or feed cattle. Wages are very low among the agricultural laborers, who are unorganized and often ill-educated, the pay of a full male labore frequently being only eighteen pence (less than half a dollar) for a day's work. The life of the countryman is dull and monotonous, and he can take no part in local government or in affairs in which he is deeply interested, such as the administration of the poor law or the land law. Then our system of land tenure is avowedly intended to keep up the large estates of large land-owners, and to prevent the subdivision of these estates among the many ; the country clergyman is often unsympathetic, or rather, his natural sympathies are by birth and education with the land-owner rather than with the laborer ; the village school is not a centre of popular education, but a department of the clergyman's household. In fact, the country districts have hitherto profited little by the democratic progress of recent years. A notable conference was held in London in December, at which four hundred delegates from the rural districts met and discussed the situation. There was no definite policy decided on, but it was made abundantly clear that the great demands of the country laborers were for popular self-government in the first place, and, in the second place, for such a reform of the land laws as would enable the laborer to acquire rights over a piece of land which he might call his own. Whether the Liberal party, which promises to carry out reforms in these directions if returned to power, will succeed, or whether the country dwellers will be satisfied with the more

moderate programme which the Conservatives profess themselves willing to undertake, remains to be seen. At present the one fact patent is, that both parties are making a bid for the rural vote.

Another political fact which is exciting keen anticipation is the promise of the Conservative leaders to introduce early next session an Irish Local Government Bill. At present the local government of Ireland is as bureaucratic and centralized as that of France, or even of Russia; and a change is bound to be made.

Many Conservatives view the inevitable step with feelings of aversion, knowing that popular local government in Ireland means more power in the hands of the Nationalists, while other Conservatives regard the promise made on their party's behalf with the hope that popular local government in Ireland will destroy any reasonableness there may be in the demand for the statutory Irish Parliament of Home Rule. This political question is unfortunately confounded with a religious issue in the North of Ireland, where the Protestants and Catholics exist in almost equal numbers, and where the tension between the two parties is very great. Also in the minds of a not inconsiderable number of Englishmen the Irish question is regarded, not as a matter of political principle, but purely as a question of Popery or Protestantism. "No popery" has been a powerful political cry in the past, and there seem to be not a few who are led by it at the present.

Joseph King.

HAMPSTEAD, LONDON.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

A Winter in India and Malaysia among the Methodist Missions. By Rev. M. V. B. Knox, Ph. D., D. D. With an Introduction by Bishop John F. Hurst, D. D., LL. D. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Pp. 306. \$1.20.—This is a very lively work, full of all manner of interesting items. The author is a born ornithologist, and fills his Indian scenes with plumage and the whirring of wings. The missionary descriptions are, as the title signifies, almost entirely confined to the Methodist missions. There is hardly allusion enough to the fact that there are other missions to obviate the impression that the gospel in India is represented almost exclusively by Methodism. The author, of course, assumes that his readers are not without access to other books, but we can hardly praise this entire absorption in his own denomination, and somewhat over-effusive glorification of it, as a signal merit. But it is an interesting book for any one to read.

General View of the Political History of Europe. By Ernest Lavisse, Professor at the Sorbonne. Translated with the Author's Sanction. By Charles Gross, Ph. D., Instructor in History, Harvard University. New York: Longmans, Green, & Co., 15 East Sixteenth Street. 1891. Pp. viii, 188.—This little book is packed wonderfully full. To say that it is luminous as well as condensed is simply to say that it comes from an eminent Frenchman.

The writer — something we fancy unusual in his country — subordinates the Renaissance to the Middle Ages and the nineteenth century, finding

in the former the national germs which have fully unclosed in the latter. He leaves to chance and human freedom a large scope as against the fatality of nature and of historical sequence. Very naturally, he makes France the chief representative of human freedom, which a century ago threw history into a new channel, and which, he not obscurely intimates, is in this century called to thwart historical fatality incarnated in Germany.

Going back to Greece, M. Lavisse well calls it "Europe reflected and condensed in a mirror." In its wider ultimate form of Hellenism, "It broke up Roman unity in the last days of the Empire. During the Middle Ages it was antagonistic to the ideas and systems of which the West made trial, and it destroyed the ecclesiastical unity of the Christian world." And in the Renaissance it rejuvenated thought, "and produced the intellectual development of modern times."

The author admires the profound effects of the Roman power, but has considerable misgivings as to how far they were all beneficial. The element of force, physical, hierarchical, intellectual, involved in the name of Rome, repels him. Centuries of unhappy experiences were needed before the nations which she had paralyzed could constitute themselves. She is always the same. And the nations which she did not conquer, leaving a heritage of mental limitation, seem to have the longer future before them. "It is not certain that Cæsar's conquest of Vercingetorix was a blessing to the world."

"The Empire was for a long time a piece of hypocrisy; for it did not dare to give to its rulers the first condition of stability, a law of succession. At length the monarchy had to be organized, but thenceforth it was absolute, without restraint or opposition. Its proposed aim was to exploit the world, an aim which in practice was carried to an extreme. Hence it exhausted the *orbis Romanus*." The Gospel overthrew the Empire. "Render to Caesar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's," reft Cæsar from his apotheosis, and shook the immutable rock. In after ages the Church herself restored the Empire, but only as a magnificent, though potent illusion, for illusions are also facts.

"Like ancient Rome, the Church conquered and assimilated. The intellectual sap of the ancient would no longer produce anything but miserable flowerets without color or perfume. The Church, on the other hand, attracted intelligent men by her literature, history, dialectics, the philosophy of her dogma, and her words of eternal life." "The Rome of St. Peter began her conquests where the Rome of Augustus finished hers, in Britain and Germany." "Hence it was the papacy which first enlarged Europe." Yet the author is not too certain that the papacy was necessary. "One thing appears certain: if the past is beneficent, because it initiates new generations into the experience of bygone ages, it abuses its power. To the living some things in the past seem like impish pranks. One of these pranks was the reestablishment of the Empire, in the year 800, by a priest and a warrior, neither of whom knew exactly what the ancient Empire had been, and what the new one was to be."

The following sentence seems bewildered by a false translation. "Thus from the wreck of the two universal powers the various nationalities emerged. Just as Christianity had succeeded the Roman Empire, so Europe succeeded Christianity." We take it the original here (and in some other places) is, *Chrétienté* "Christendom," not *Christianisme*. Christendom is here regarded in its mediæval form, as a theocratic con-

federation. The author allows that Christendom, thus defined, was succeeded by states, but not by nations. "A nation is a definitely formed, conscious, and responsible person; there were no real nations on the Continent before our own times."

M. Lavisne acquits the mediaeval papacy of offending against a non-existent Italian nationality. Nevertheless, like Gregorovius, he points out how the universal aims of the papacy and the national aims of Italy have never been reconcilable. Yet the communion of Italy, as of Greece, found some compensation in the intense and various life of the parts. German anarchy, also, "was very energetic and fruitful." The Slavonic and Germanic complications are fully though compactly set forth, implicated also with the Magyars. "Hence there is at the present day a Hungarian question, as there is a Tsech question; and the Hapsburg, whose function it is to solve both, will solve neither." Like David Müller, he points out that the two German great powers, Austria and Prussia, were both "born in the midst of the enemy," both rest on conquering and assimilating colonies planted in the midst of the Slavs. But as Germanism gained in the East it lost in the West. "While margraves guarded the course of the Elbe, the Rhine became the 'highway of the priests.' German energy, so conspicuous in the East, languished in these principalities of archbishops, bishops, and abbots. By the close of the fifteenth century the Empire had lost almost all its western dependencies, while France was gaining ground in this territory."

The author gives a very interesting account of the slow formation of France, of how the lean phantom of decaying Carolingian royalty, amid a crowd of indifferent vassals, changed itself into flesh and blood when Hugh Capet, Duke of France, brought dominions of its own to the crown, while the unfailing line of male offspring gave continuity to its aims, and by a judicious use of old remembrances and new inheritances and resumptions, and also by the help of the cities and of the bishops, the crowned shadow at length became proprietor of France. "The expansion of France in Europe during the Middle Ages was preëminently intellectual. Her intellect gave expression to the whole civilization of that period, — religious, feudal, and knightly. The French wrote heroic poems, built castles and cathedrals, and interpreted the texts of Aristotle and the Scriptures. Their songs, buildings, and scholastic philosophy verged on perfection. Already independent, already mobile and sprightly, the French mind freed itself from tradition and authority. It produced the aerial grace of Gothic art. It parodied its own heroic songs, and sculptured caricatures on the walls of its monuments of religion." "A proverb said that the world was ruled by three powers, — the Papacy, the Empire, and Learning; the first residing in Rome, the second in Germany, the third in Paris." France "existed at first in and through the king, who, in his living flesh and in his privileged blood, personified the idea, still too abstract, of a nation, a country."

The development of England is well set forth. "This good order of a well regulated monarchy and the power of the monarch produced an unexpected result, namely, political liberty. Just because the king had everything in his own hands," — in opposition to the vassal states of each continental monarchy, — "because the rights and duties of all were defined with precision, because each person easily came in contact with all, because people saw, knew, and elbowed each other, the resistance to a power that was too strong was easily organized, and with the first attempt at

tained its object." "England of the fifteenth century was more than a state; it was almost a nation." "Her vocation abroad was not yet revealed; but she had various powers in reserve; the power of a sanguine, vigorous, and vehement temperament, and the power which is produced by freedom and by the spirit of independence. These she was at first to waste in her civil and religious wars; but eventually she employed them to found an Empire, the most extensive and flourishing that history has known."

The development of modern times is more complicated. We do not remember to have seen before so distinct a statement of the mischief which French feudalism, even in dying, left behind. "These empty structures — provinces, municipalities, and feudal lordships — cumbered France, and incommoded her life. The power that turned them into ruins would not, or could not, remove the débris, which caused much disorder in the constitution of France. The resistance of such vestiges of the past was encountered by the great ministers of France, by those of the time of her full glory, and by those of the close of the ancient régime; for example, Colbert and Turgot. The old monarchy shone in Europe with great brilliancy. It contributed to the sum total of the greatness of France the majesty of Louis XIV., which was a real majesty. But the monarchy did not establish a system of government and administration adapted to a unified country. It did not provide itself with a good financial and military system; it did not give the country a good judicial and economic system. To speak the truth in all its nakedness, French kings knew how to exact obedience, but they did not know how to govern."

The author puts, of course, France at the head of nations, because her unity is not fused with race, and has therefore the value of a moral personality. Yet he holds that Pan-Germanism and Pan-Slavism cannot long avoid a decisive struggle. He holds the papacy to be quite as dangerous to Italian nationality as any one has ever thought. "The Emperor of Germany is very potent, but when he visited the King of Italy, it was beyond his power to refuse to pay his respects to the Pope. The Emperor of Austria calls himself the good brother and special friend of Humbert I., but he does not visit Rome for fear of committing sacrilege."

German unity the author stigmatizes as a conquest by Prussia. The hearty willingness of the South German people to be "conquered" is not mentioned. As to Alsace-Lorraine, of course he is implacable. Does anybody imagine that if Sedan had been a French victory, the Germans of the left bank of the Rhine would have been asked if they were willing to be appropriated by France?

This book, in size a manual, is, in substance, a profound history. As will be seen, the translation is vigorous and free enough for an original.

English Colonization and Empire. By Alfred Caldecott, M. A. (Cambridge and London), Fellow and Dean of St. John's College, Cambridge; sometime University Extension Lecturer under the Cambridge Syndicate. "Of all the results of English History none is comparable to the creation of this enormous, prosperous, in great part homogeneous Realm, and it can be paralleled by nothing in the history of any other state" (Professor Seeley). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 743 and 745 Broadway. 1891. [All rights reserved.] Pp. viii, 277.—The fine but clear print enables a great deal to be put into this book. After slightly touching on Egyptian and Babylonian and Greek civilization,

and on the welding process of Rome, the author remarks that then, between the Carpathians and the Atlantic, was developed the first civilization which seems likely to become the common possession of mankind, and which England, principally, is now diffusing over the world. The community of mankind is forming. The great masses are all now in contact, — the Chinese mass of four hundred millions, the Indian mass of three hundred millions, the European mass of three hundred millions.

The author considers the colonizing enterprises of Portugal, Spain, France, Holland, and Britain. He quotes from Hegel the remark that the discovery of America by Columbus was an event of the same order as Julius Cesar's crossing the Alps.

The author distinguishes between pure colonies, like Australia and Canada, mixed colonies, like South Africa or Jamaica, dependencies, like India, and mere outposts, like Gibraltar or Aden. Thus the English are brought into direct and effective contact with all the great nationalities of the world.

The glory of Prince Henry of Portugal, the father of all modern enterprise, is not overlooked. As to Spain, the author notes the extraordinary contradictions of character which produced "in Las Casas a flower of missionaries, and a queen of singularly high and tender soul in Isabella; and also a ruffian leader like Pizarro, and the godless inhumanity which harried out of life in fifteen years fifteen sixteenths of the natives of Hispaniola."

The Dutch failed because they were too sordid. The greatness of distant view which gave permanence to English enterprise was lacking to them. France was great, and achieved great things, and is achieving great things now in Algeria. But it was appointed that her American dominion should yield to England, though the French race, we may remark, is unassimilable in Canada, and promises to appropriate all northern New England. Personal government could not produce a succession of men like Colbert, that greatest of administrators. Chatham, however, came from the very heart of England, and was a Man, whom no George could put down. France, under Louis Quinze and Louis Seize, had to give way, and leave England "free room for national development."

The author protests against assuming that the thirteen colonies were entirely in the right, and asks, Where was their gratitude for help against France? Surely, they were acknowledged by Parliament to have done more than their part. He allows, however, that they had outgrown dependence. He says, with sarcastic truth, that we have ever since been trying to live inside of a ring fence.

The remarks on India are very full, but less important to us. He observes, very justly, that English dominion there does not really rest on force, but on the Hindoo persuasion that the *Pax Britannica* is the alternative to the old anarchy.

After 1783 there was "Reconstruction, and fresh Expansion." The wonderful development of Australia was against all augury. This has been almost wholly industrial. There is nothing in it as yet to take hold of the imagination. Canada he assumes to have made a success of federation, as he calls that row of sticks laid end to end, which Goldwin Smith shows this to be. The less said about Canada at present, the more comfortable, we should think, it would be for Canada. The author, however, allows that the destiny of Canada cannot be detached from our final decision respecting it.

The last six chapters concern the final partition of power between the United Kingdom and the Colonies. The treatment is full, clear, and dispassionate, evidently leaning to the notion of Imperial Federation, but treating this altogether tentatively. The author does not answer Goldwin Smith's overwhelming objections to this, but evidently hopes that *solvetur ambulando*. He looks for such a devolution of authority from the British Parliament under Home Rule as shall reduce it once more to the Parliament of England, Scotland, Ireland. Colonies are then to come in to a wider federation on about the same terms. This would be "Reconstruction and Fresh Expansion" with a witness. It would be happy for the historical England if she did not perish in this Medea's caldron of transmutation.

The Divine Enterprise of Missions. A Series of Lectures, Delivered at New Brunswick, N. J., before the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America. Upon the "Graves" Foundation. In the months of January and February, 1891. By Arthur T. Pierson. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 740 and 742 Broadway. Pp. 333. — The author wisely begins by protesting against the unscriptural division of believers into *clergy* and *laity*, which confines all active fulfillment of Christ's commission to the latter. He does not deny the distinction as of relative force, but denies that it is original or fundamental. All believers, in some form, are addressed in the command (probably given to the five hundred): "Go ye, therefore."

Dr. Pierson insists that Christ's principal command is, "Bear witness." "Evangelize," in the Greek, does not mean, "to convert," but "to bring the good tidings." Results are with divine predestination and human freedom. But this, he remarks, includes more than a mere hasty passing through. It does not, however, necessarily include the Christianization of a race, but the offering to it of a true opportunity. The author, nevertheless, presses the image of the New Jerusalem let down out of heaven to a degree which looks as if the essential powers of human nature and divine results of history were all to be rejected out of the kingdom of God. A little more, and personal identity would perish under such a stress of argument. But the godless extent to which the idea of assimilation is carried is very energetically set forth. The church is an "election." Yet it is to be, not a painful picking out of one here and one there, but the calling out of "a great multitude which no man can number." Yet cultivation must not destroy the seed vessels.

The author chastises the self-complacency which dwells on twelve million dollars a year for foreign missions, by pointing out that one per cent. of the income of Protestant church-members would give two hundred million dollars. The conditions of growth, when life ceases, hasten decay, and the prosperity of the church, enjoyed, not used, will destroy her.

The degeneracy of Missions into mere civilization is a crying danger of our age. A sense of "the powers of the world to come" will alone make them a reality. But miracles innumerable, of divine grace, if not of physical power, it is to be hoped, may sustain the standard. If the Reformation was "the Third Great Birth of Time," does not the Fourth now impend? Are we to be found sleeping?

Charles C. Starbuck.

ANDOVER.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York. Into his Marvellous Light. Studies in Life and Belief. By Charles Cuthbert Hall, D. D., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, N. Y. Pp. 354. 1892. \$1.50. — The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri. Translated by Charles Eliot Norton. II. Purgatory. Pp. ix, 216. 1892. \$1.25. — The Spirit of Modern Philosophy. An Essay in the Form of Lectures. By Josiah Royce, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University. Pp. xv, 519. 1892. \$2.50.

Roberts Brothers, Boston. Holy Names, as Interpretations of the Story of the Manger and the Cross. By the Rev. Julian K. Smyth, author of "Footprints of the Saviour." Pp. 203. 1891.

A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. The Expositor's Bible. The Acts of the Apostles. By the Rev. G. T. Stokes, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, and Vicar of All Saints, Blackrock. Pp. xiii, 419. 1891. \$1.50. For sale by De Wolfe, Fiske & Co., Boston. — The Sermon Bible. Vol. VIII. John iv.—Acts vi. Pp. vi, 395. 1892. \$1.50. For sale by De Wolfe, Fiske & Co., Boston.

The Students Publishing Company, Hartford. The Genesis of Genesis. A Study of the Documentary Sources of the First Book of Moses in accordance with the results of Critical Science, illustrating the Presence of Bibles within the Bible. By Benjamin Wisner Bacon. With an Introduction by George F. Moore, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. Pp. xxx, 352. 1892. \$2.50.

The Baker & Taylor Co., New York. The Divine Enterprise of Missions. A Series of Lectures delivered at New Brunswick, N. J., before the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America, upon the "Graves" Foundation, in the months of January and February, 1891. By Arthur T. Pierson. Pp. 333.

A. S. Barnes & Co., New York. Bible Studies from the Old and New Testaments, covering the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1892. By Geo. F. Pentecost, D. D., author of "In the Volume of the Book," "Out of Egypt," etc. Pp. xii, 415. 1892.

Dodd, Mead & Co., New York. Short Studies in Literature. By Hamilton Wright Mabie, author of "My Study Fire," "Under the Trees and Elsewhere," etc., etc. Pp. vi, 201. 1891.

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. The Real Japan. Studies of Contemporary Japanese Manners, Morals, Administration, and Politics. By Henry Norman. Illustrated by Photographs by the author. Pp. 364. 1892. \$3.00. — Patrick Henry. Life, Correspondence, and Speeches. By William Wirt Henry. With Portrait. Limited Edition eleven hundred copies, printed from type. 8vo. Vol. I., pp. xx, 622; Vol. II., pp. xv, 650. 1891. \$8.00. — University Extension Manuals. Edited by Professor Knight. The Literature of France. By H. G. Keene, Hon. M. A., Oxon. Pp. 215. 1892. \$1.00. For sale by Damrell & Upham, Boston. — Patrick Henry. Life, Correspondence, and Speeches. By William Wirt Henry. With Portrait. Vol. III. Limited edition eleven hundred copies, printed from type. 8vo, pp. 672. 1891. \$4.00, net. For sale by Damrell & Upham, Boston. — The Life of our Lord upon the Earth. Considered in its Historical, Chronological, and Geographical Relations. By Samuel J. Andrews, author of "God's Revelations of Himself to Men." A New and wholly Revised Edition. Pp. xxviii, 651. 1891. \$2.50. For sale by Damrell & Upham, Boston.

Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. The Place of Authority in Matters of Religious Belief. By Vincent Henry Stanton, D. D., Fellow of Trinity College, and Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Pp. xii, 229. 1891. \$1.75. — Anthropological Religion. The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1891. By F. Max Müller, K. M. Foreign Member of the French Institute. Pp. xxvii, 464. 1892. \$3.00.

Henry Holt & Co., New York. Series of Modern Philosophers. Edited by E. Hershey Sneath, Ph. D. The Philosophy of Locke. In Extracts from the Essay Concerning Human Understanding. Arranged with Introductory Notes, by John E. Russell, A. M., Mark Hopkins Professor of Philosophy in Williams College. Pp. iv, 157. 1891. Teachers' price, \$1.00. — American Science Series, Briefer Course. Psychology. By William James, Professor of Psychology in Harvard University. Pp. xiii, 478. 1892. Teachers' price, \$1.60. *Robert Clarke & Co., Cincinnati.* Classical Poems. By William Entriken Baily. Pp. 108. 1892.

Advertiser Printing House, Newark, N. J. The Saengerfest Sermons. By James Boyd Brady, B. D., D. D., Pastor of Franklin Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Newark, N. J. Pp. xi, 323. 1891.

The Trenton Electric Printing Co., Trenton, N. J. Thirteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Statistics of Labor and Industries of New Jersey, for the year ending October 31, 1890. Pp. xvi, 474. 1891.

Max Stern & Co., Printers, Chicago. The Hebrew Verb; A Series of Tabular Studies. By Augustus S. Carrier, Adjunct Professor of Biblical Philology in McCormick Theological Seminary. Pp. 33. 1891. 30 cents.

The Young Churchman Co., Milwaukee, Wis. Jesus Christ, the Proof of Christianity. By John F. Spalding, S. T. D., Bishop of Colorado. Pp. 220. 1891. \$1.00.

C. J. Clay & Sons, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, London. Pitt Press Mathematical Series. Arithmetic for Schools. By Charles Smith, M. A., Master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, author of Treatises on Conic Sections, Solid Geometry, Algebra, and Elementary Algebra. Pp. viii, 340. 1891. — Pitt Press Series. Lucian, Menippus, et Timon. With English Notes by E. C. Mackie, B. A., Late Classical Master at Heversham Grammar School. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. Pp. xxxv, 157. 1892. — Pitt Press Series. Livy. Book IX. With Introduction and Notes by H. M. Stephenson, M. A., Late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, Late Head Master of St. Peter's School, York. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. Pp. xxvi, 152. 1892.

Librairie Fischbacher, Paris. Le Problème de l'Immortalité, par E. Petavel-Olliff, Ancien Pasteur, Docteur en Théologie. Étude Précedée d'une Lettre de Charles Sécrétan, Professeur de Philosophie à l'Université de Lausanne, Correspondant de l'Institut de France. Tome Second. Pp. 499. 1892.

PAMPHLETS. — *Government Printing Office, Washington.* Reports from the Consuls of the United States. Issued from the Bureau of Statistics, Department of State. All requests for these Reports should be addressed to the Secretary of State, No. 130, July, 1891, No. 131, August, 1891. — *H. L. Hastings, Boston.* A Great Opportunity. By Margaret W. Leitch, Ceylon. An Address delivered at the Tenth Annual Conference of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor. Pp. 38. 20 cents. — Will the Old Book Stand? By H. L. Hastings. Pp. 23. 5 cents.

